DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 210 SO 015 842

TITLE Oversight Hearing on Arts Education. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, Second Session (February 28, 1984).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 84

NOTE 41p.; Contains many pages of small type.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; *Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; Fine Arts; Hearings; Music Education; Visual Arts

IDENTIFIERS *Congress 98th; Proposed Legislation

ABSTRACT

This congressional hearing contains testimony supporting the need to strengthen the priority given to arts education in elementary and secondary education. The hearings convened with a panel of witnesses representing the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), the National Committee on Arts for the Handicapped (NCAH), and the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). The first witness, chairman of the NEA, presented statistics representing the current state of arts education and documented support for arts education by discussing supporting statements of the presidential commission in "A Nation At Risk," the College Board in "Academic Preparation for College," and the Carnegie Foundation in "High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America." The second witness, Laureen Summers (NCAH), gave a personal testimony to the value of art education in her life as a cerebral palsy victim. The third witness, from MENC, then reported on the status of music education, listed suggestions for those interested in the arts, and presented supporting statements from "The Paideia Proposal" and from reports by the Carnegie Foundation and John Goodlad. Prepared statements, letters, and supplemental materials in favor of arts education were also presented by congressional representatives from Vermont, New York, Wisconsin, and Illinois; a consultant in the arts and education; and representatives from NCAH, the National Art Education Association, the Children's Art Carnival, the Louisville Orchestra, the Alliance for Art Education, and the Lexington Philharmonic. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

50

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON ARTS EDUCATION

ED247210

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON FEBRUARY 28, 1984

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SO 015 842

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
33-785 O WASHINGTON : 1984

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
RON PACKARD, California
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
HOWARD C. NELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington,
Ex Officio
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C. on February 28, 1984	1
Statement of:	
Hodsoll, Hon. Frank, chairman, National Endowment for the Arts; Laureen Summers, artist, Washington, DC, and special projects assistant, National Committee on Arts for the Handicapped; and Dr. Paul Lehman, president-elect, Music Educators National Conference, a panel	2
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:	
Cannon, Dr. Daniel G., executive director, National Art Education Association, Reston, VA, article entitled, "Where Do We Come From, Where Are We, Where Are We Going? The Arts As Basic In Education"	26
Collins, Hon. Cardiss, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois and chairwoman, House Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee, prepared statement of	21
Dobbs, Karen R., general manager, the Louisville Orchestra, Louisville, KY, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 23, 1984	35
Downey, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	20
Fowler, Charles B., consultant in the arts and education, editor of Musical America/High Fidelity Magazine, prepared statement of	23
Hodsoll, Frank, chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, chairman, National Council on the Arts, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	2
Jeffords, Hon. James M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Vermont, prepared statement of	19
Kramer, Lynne, immediate past president, advocacy chairman, Alliance for Arts Education/New Jersey, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 4, 1984	35
Lehman, Paul R., professor and associate dean, school of music, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; president-elect, Music Educators National Conference, Reston, VA, prepared statement of	9
Moody, Hon. Jim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, prepared statement of	21
Moore, Linda G., general manager, Lexington Philharmonic, Lexington, KY, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 23, 1984	37
The Children's Art Carnival, New York, NY, prepared statement of	34
The National Committee, Arts with the Handicapped, prepared statement of	25

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON ARTS EDUCATION

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1984

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:38 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins and Jeffords.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, majority counsel and Electra Beahler, Republican education counsel.

Chairman PERKINS. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is holding an oversight hearing on arts education. I want to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues, Mr. Jeffords and Mr. Downey and the other members of the Congressional Arts Caucus for their ongoing interest in this area and for initiating this hearing.

For many years there was a separate arts in education program authorizing grants at the elementary and secondary levels. In 1981 this program was folded into chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. At present States and local school districts have the discretion to decide whether to use money for arts education.

I hope this morning's hearing will help us discover ways to encourage arts education. I look forward to hearing the witnesses' testimony.

Our first witness—we have got a panel—is the Honorable Frank Hodsoll, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. Come around. Then we have Laureen Summers, artist, Washington, D.C., and Dr. Paul Lehman. Is he here? You come around, too.

We'll hear from you first, Mr. Hodsoll. Identify yourself and go ahead.

Mr. HODSOLL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. I understand Mr. David Bailey, executive director, Jazzmobile, N.Y., could not make it this morning.

Go right ahead, Mr. Hodsoll.

STATEMENT OF A PANEL OF WITNESSES CONSISTING OF HON. FRANK HODSOLL, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS; LAUREEN SUMMERS, ARTIST, WASHINGTON, D.C., AND SPECIAL PROJECTS ASSISTANT, NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ARTS FOR THE HANDICAPPED; AND DR. PAUL LEHMAN, PRESIDENT-ELECT, MUSIC EDUCATORS NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. HODSOLL. My name is Frank Hodsoll and I am Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. I have prepared testimony, Mr. Chairman, that I would like, if I could, to submit for the record. I will summarize that at this point.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, your full statement will be entered in the record.

[Prepared statement of Frank Hodsoll follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FRANK HODSOLL, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am very pleased to have the opportunity to be here today to discuss a subject which I feel is of tremendous importance. The Subcommittee is to be commended for its interest in Arts Education and for holding this hearing. The Arts Endowment is very honored and pleased to be asked to be here.

Arts education has been emphasized as a priority by virtually all of the Endowment's programs at nearly every seminar on the state of the arts we have had to date. We believe that a broader public that can see and hear intelligently is essential to appreciation of the arts.

Statistical information about arts education in the U.S. is unfortunately spotty and often contradictory. There is no national data base upon which to draw.

In her recent book, "Instant Art, Instant Culture," Laura Chapman contends that about 80 percent of our nation's youth graduate from high school without ever having had meaningful instruction in the arts. She says that less than one percent of the total time spent between kindergarten and 12th grade is devoted to studying the arts with a qualified teacher; and that very few schools impose graduation requirements in the arts. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, in 1979, high school students knew less about music than their peers knew in 1971; and in visual arts, test performances declined while intolerance of nonrepresentational art increased during the same period.

On the other hand, the National Assessment's study on "Art and Young Americans, 1974-1979" shows that as of 1978, over three quarters of all 13-year olds were taking at least one art class in junior high, and more than 40 percent were taking art in both 7th and 8th grade. A study appearing in the "Digest of Education Statistics, 1980," on enrollments and course offerings in public secondary schools, reveals that in 1972-73 32.9 percent of secondary school students were taking Music—a slight decline from 1960-61 and 1948-49—while 27.5 percent were taking visual arts, a considerable increase over both of the prior periods. These figures, of course, tell us nothing about course content and quality or teacher qualifications, and are a decade old.

Our Endowment Survey of Public Participation in the Arts shows that most Americans have never had any form of artistic instruction at all: 53 percent have had no instruction in Music; 76 percent, no ballet; and 82 percent, no creative writing. The survey shows that the higher one's educational attainment, and the higher one's income bracket, the more likely one is to have had some form of artistic instruction. Of those who have had instruction in music or visual arts, it most likely occurred between the ages of 12 and 17.

The National Center for Education Statistics says that arts teachers (all disciplines) were 3.7 percent of all secondary teachers in 1971, only 2.4 percent in 1976, and, surprisingly, were back up to 3.5 percent in 1981. A very useful article by George Hardiman and Andra Johnson on "The Condition of Art Education" estimates that as of 1982 there were about 53,000 certified visual art teachers in the public schools (25,000 in high schools), with another 2,500 in private schools. Hardiman and Johnson say that "The number of full time art teachers employed by public secondary schools decreased by approximately 15 percent during the past decade. Most of these losses have occurred during the last five years, and are at

about the same proportion as the decreases seen in secondary school enrollments nationwide for the same period."

As far as the elementary schools are concerned, Hardiman and Johnson see a mixed bag. They say that, "While the number of secondary art teachers has decreased, the number of art teachers at the elementary level has slowly increased during the last decade. The time allotted for teaching in the elementary schools averaged 60 minutes per week in 1960 and about 70 minutes in 1980." Hardiman and Johnson point out that elementary schools are committing only four percent of the school week to art instruction, with only a quarter of that provided by trained art teachers. According to Hardiman and Johnson, the number of secondary schools offering art courses increased by 57 percent between 1960 and 1980, reaching a level of 85 percent of all such schools in 1980. These data may indicate that fewer art teachers are teaching more arts courses; or that regular classroom teachers are taking responsibility for them. It is clear from the conflicting and incomplete information currently available that much remains to be done in gathering and analyzing comprehensive data on the state of the arts education.

The recent publication of "A Nation at Risk," the report of the President's Commission on Educational Excellence, which was followed by a rash of other studies criticizing the public schools and pointing to declines in test scores over the past twenty years, has spawned an ongoing discussion about the methods, goals, and especially about the content of American education from kindergarten through high school. Not for the first time, calls for "back to basics" are heard on every hand.

The encouraging fact is that some of these reports include the arts as a basic. While the Presidential Commission's "Five New Basics" (English, math, science, social studies and computer studies) did not include the arts, it did state that the K-8 curriculum should provide "a sound base for study in a number of areas including the arts." The Commission went on to say that in high school a high level of shared education in the five basics "together with work in the fine and performing arts and foreign languages, constitutes the mind and spirit of our culture."

The College Board Report, "Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and be Able to Do," specifically named the arts (along with English, math, science, social studies and foreign language), as "The Basic Academic Competencies" for *all* high school students. Similarly, the Carnegie Foundation's "High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America" also included the arts in its "core curriculum"—together with writing, speech, literature, science, math, foreign language, western civilization, nonwestern studies, U.S. history, technology and health.

The prime attention devoted to the arts by the College Board is especially significant. The Report summarizes the following competencies which college students should achieve in the arts:

"The ability to understand and appreciate the unique qualities of each of the arts.

"The ability to appreciate how people of various cultures have used the arts to express themselves.

"The ability to understand and appreciate different artistic styles and works from representative historical periods and cultures.

"Some knowledge of the social and intellectual influences affecting artistic form.

"The ability to use the skills, media, and processes required to express themselves in one or more of the arts."

Arts education can take a number of forms: "doing" art (learning to play musical instruments, or paint, or dance, or perform drama, or write poetry); being exposed to art (by attending performances or exhibitions of art, or by working with resident artists); learning about art in relation to civilization, perhaps in conjunction with other academic subjects; or studying and learning how to appreciate art for its own sake.

Since education is properly a local concern, and because we are not educators, the Endowment does not intend to define what the content and methodology of arts education should be. But we are engaged in efforts to ascertain what works best, and with whom; and the results of our explorations will be made widely available for those who may wish to initiate or enhance arts education programs. Based upon what we already know, it seems to us that arts education is most effective when a number of complementary approaches are combined, often through local collaborations between schools, resident artists, arts institutions, and other local groups with expertise in arts education, or resources to offer for better programs.

Tom Wolf, the former Executive Director of the New England Arts Foundation, has been commissioned by the Endowment to do a study of arts education programs in New England and New York. We regard this as an especially important undertaking which could lead to studies in other regions. The study will identify and

assess arts education programs which have succeeded, and those which have failed; in either case it will attempt to explain why. One key focus of the Wolf Study will be an evaluation methodology for use in assessing arts education programs. The report will include contributions from many sources, both public and private.

In addition to our exploration of optimal arts education approaches, methodologies and partnerships, we are taking a series of steps to strengthen the Endowment's contribution to arts education.

First, we have scheduled a series of five regional seminars on arts education during 1984, which will bring together many groups and individuals who can help to identify the best ways to build effective arts education programs and to coordinate them with state and local decision-makers. The seminars, will be co-sponsored by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies.

Second, we are in the process of forming a partnership with the J. Paul Getty Trust to develop a pilot series of television programs for children. This initiative will seek to capitalize on the unique capacities of television to bring sustained arts education into the lives of young Americans.

Third, we are looking at ways in which teacher education might be strenthened so as to enrich regular and sustained teaching in the arts. In this area we are considering approaches such as the very successful summer seminars developed by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Fourth, we are exploring the possibility of placing a new emphasis on arts education in and by arts institutions, through the Endowment's disciplinary programs. Many leading arts institutions already have exemplary educational programs, often in cooperation with local school systems, and we would like to build upon this base.

Finally, we will continue our support for artist residencies in schools and other institutions through our Artists in Education Program. Since this program began in 1969, over 14.3 million students have benefitted from the residencies of approximately 30,700 artists in 57,800 school and community sites in all 50 states and six special jurisdictions. These artist residencies can provide a highly valuable supplement to regular, comprehensive arts education.

At present some 44.3 million young Americans attend public schools in about 16,000 school districts across the country. Far too few of them are given the opportunity to learn and grow through sustained teaching in the arts. At the same time, some 45 states have educational task forces studying ways to strengthen public school education, and many of them are giving serious consideration to the recommendations contained in the reports of the Excellence Commission, the Carnegie Foundation, and the College Board.

"The arts challenge and extend human experience. They provide means of expression that go beyond ordinary speaking and writing. They can express intimate thoughts and feelings. They are a unique record of diverse cultures and how these cultures have developed over time. They provide distinctive ways of understanding human beings and nature. The arts are creative modes by which all people can enrich their lives both by self-expression and response to the expressions of others.

"Works of art often involve subtle meanings and complex systems of expression. Fully appreciating such works requires the careful reasoning and sustained study that leads to informed insight. Moreover, just as through understanding of science requires laboratory or field work, so fully understanding the arts involves firsthand work in them.

"Preparation in the arts will be valuable to college entrants whatever their intended field of study. . . . For some, such college-level work will lead to careers in the arts. For many others, it will permanently enhance the quality of their lives, whether they continue artistic activity as an avocation or appreciation of the arts as observers and members of audiences."

It is our hope that we at the Endowment can work with the Congress, other federal agencies, and those concerned at the state and local level to encourage awareness of the very vital benefits of arts education. We want in particular to foster recognition in the school systems across the country that comprehensive arts education for all students should be one of the basics—kindergarten through twelfth grade. This hearing is an important and positive step in making this case.

Mr. HODSOLL. I am pleased to have the opportunity to be here to discuss this subject because I think it is of tremendous importance and I commend the subcommittee for its interest in arts education and for holding this hearing.

The Arts Endowment, in particular, is honored and pleased to be asked to be here. We also thank the Congressional Arts Caucus

and, in particular, Congressman Jeffords, amd others who have indicated such a great interest in this area. I might also add that it is propitious to be addressing you, sir, in that in the State of Kentucky you have a wide variety of very good arts education programs which, I think, are exemplary.

Arts education has been emphasized as a priority by virtually every one of our Endowment programs—in theater, dance, visual arts, literature, and so on—and at nearly every seminar on policy and programing that we have had to date. We believe that a broader public that can see and hear intelligently is essential to appreciation of the arts and it's also essential, I would argue, to good citizenship. How can you walk down a street and see the buildings and the various images that are there without having some sense of the history from which they came?

As President Reagan has said on a number of occasions, "Civilizations are more often remembered by their art and thought than by any other thing," and to be a full citizen, it seems to me, our students and schools have to have some sense of this:

Statistical information about arts education in the United States is spotty and contradictory. Some say that it's increasing. Others say that it is decreasing. We don't have a national data base, so it's unclear. This is something, incidentally, that we are working on—to see if we cannot gather some across-the-board statistics as to exactly what is happening out there.

In this context also, I might note, we have very little information as to what, in fact, has been accomplished by the various kinds of arts education programs across the country. Again, we are working on developing a data base in this regard.

The Department of Education, as you noted, sir, had a program in this area which has now devolved down to the State and local level. There are some assessments from the program and we have been reviewing those, but we need, clearly, a more comprehensive base to have a better sense of how to proceed.

Our Endowment survey of public participation in the arts, however, shows that most Americans have never had any form of artistic instruction at all. Fifty-three percent have had no instruction in music; 76 percent, no ballet; 82 percent, no creative writing. That last, I think, is rather surprising.

The survey shows that the higher one's educational attainment and the higher one's income bracket, the more likely one is to have had some form of artistic instruction. Of those who have had instruction in music or visual arts, it most likely occurred between the ages of 12 and 17.

The recent publication of "A Nation At Risk," the report of the President's Commission on Educational Excellence, has spawned an ongoing discussion about the methods, goals and especially about the content of American education from kindergarten through high school, I know that this committee is very much involved in all of that.

It's not for the first time, I might note, that calls for back to basics are heard. The question is, What are the basics? An encouraging fact is that some of these reports include the arts as a basic. While the Presidential Commission's five new basics—English, math, science, social studies, and computer studies—did not include

the arts, the Commission did state that the K-8 curriculum should provide, and I quote, "a sound base for study in a number of areas, including the arts." The Commission went on to say that, "In high school a high level of shared education in the five basics, together with work in the fine and performing arts and foreign languages, constitutes the mind and spirit of our culture."

The College Board report, "Academic Preparation for College: What students need to know and to be able to do," specifically named the arts, along with English, math, science, social studies, and foreign language, as the basic academic competencies for all high school students. Similarly, the Carnegie Foundation included the arts in its core curriculun.

The prime attention devoted to the arts by the College Board, it seems to me, is especially significant. The report summarizes the following competencies which college-bound students should achieve in the arts: The ability to understand and appreciate the unique qualities of each of the arts; the ability to appreciate how people of various cultures have used the arts to express themselves; the ability to understand and appreciate different artistic styles and works from representative historical periods and cultures; some knowledge of the social and intellectual influences affecting artistic form; and the ability to use the skills, media, and processes required to express themselves in one or more of the arts.

Arts education can take a number of forms. It can be doing art—learning to play musical instruments, paint, dance, perform drama, or write poetry—or it can be being exposed to art by attending performances or exhibitions of art or by working with resident artists. It can be learning about art in relation to civilization—perhaps in conjunction with other academic subjects—or it can be studying and learning how to appreciate art for its own sake.

The Endowment does not intend to, nor could it, define what the content and methodology of arts education should be. But we are engaged in efforts to ascertain what works best and with whom; and the results of our explorations will be made widely available for those who wish to initiate or enhance arts education programs. In this regard, we are working very closely with arts educators, arts institutions and artists—basically all of the people involved.

Based upon what we already know, it seems to us that arts education is most effective when a number of complementary approaches are combined, often through local collaborations among schools, artists, arts institutions and others with expertise in arts education. We have commissioned a study of arts education programs in New England and New York to identify and assess those which have succeeded and those which have failed and we will try, in this study, attempt to explain why.

We are also in the process of developing an evaluation methodology for use in assessing these programs.

In addition to the study, we are taking a number of steps which we hope will be helpful. First, we have scheduled a series of five regional seminars in arts education during this year to help identify the best way to build effective arts education programs at the state and local level. These seminars will be co-sponsored by the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies.

Second, we are in the process of forming a partnership with the J. Paul Getty trust to develop a series of television programs on the arts for children.

Third, we are looking at ways in which teacher education might be strengthened so as to enrich regular and sustained teaching in the arts; and in this area we are considering approaches such as the very successful summer seminars developed by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Fourth, we are exploring the possibility of placing a new emphasis on arts education in and by arts institutions which have already done quite a lot in this area.

Finally, we will continue our support for artist residencies in schools and other institutions through our Artists in Education program, which is the basic program we have at the Endowment in this area.

Since this program began in 1969, over 14.3 million students have benefited from the residencies of approximately 30,700 artists, in 57,800 school and community sites in all our States and special jurisdictions. These artist residencies can provide a highly valuable supplement to regular, comprehensive arts education.

In conclusion, as the College Board notes, "The arts challenge and extend human experience. They provide means of expression that go beyond ordinary speaking and writing. They can express intimate thoughts and feelings. They are a unique record of diverse cultures and how these cultures have developed over time."

The College Board also notes that, "Works of art often involve subtle meanings and complex systems of expression. Fully appreciating such works requires the careful reasoning and sustained study that leads to informed insight."

This means that arts education, Mr. Chairman, must be systematic, it must be comprehensive, it must be regular; and this is the kind of thing that we have got to work on. I might note that in the 45 task forces that are working in different States on the question of educational reform, a number of them have identified arts education as an important matter. In particular the State of Utah has developed a very comprehensive potential curriculum in this regard.

It's our hope that we at the Endowment can work with the Congress and other Federal agencies and those concerned at the state and local level to encourage awareness of the very vital benefits of arts education. We have had discussions with the Department of Education and it seems to me that this committee, which has oversight over the Elementary and Secondary Act, is an important forum in which to discuss how we can move forward.

We want finally, in particular, to foster recognition in the school systems across the country that comprehensive arts education for all students should be one of the basics kindergarten through 12th grade. We believe that the case can be made for this. Not only is arts education important in and of itself, but there is also evidence that it can assist the development of other skills.

I urge this committee to join with us in exploring ways in which the arts can be systematically brought into the schools. We have an opportunity in the debate on education, but there is also a risk. We

at the Endowment very much look forward to working with this committee to these ends.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you for some excellent testimony this morning.

Ms. Laureen Summers. Is she around? Go ahead, Laureen Summers.

Ms. SUMMERS Thank you and good morning. I don't know whether I feel a little nervous because I am here or because I left my 10-week-old new baby with her father, but I am delighted to be here.

My personal involvement in the arts began in grade school just outside of New York City. In the fourth grade I made a collage that was much liked by my teachers and classmates who were surprised at my hidden talent. For the first time I felt truly appreciated for being me, for creating something that was totally my own, which had no right or wrong answers. It was an accomplishment that allowed me to relax from having to constantly prove to others that despite having cerebral palsy, I was really OK.

Years later, weaving provided me with that same artistic satisfaction. My accomplishment in this area took me through doorways where I was sometimes afraid to enter. I began to associate with many people whom I once thought impossible to reach because of my disability. My peers and my colleagues respected and applauded who I was and realized that my disability was not all of me after all.

During the past 11 years I have taught weaving to schoolchildren in a variety of settings. In addition, I have taught both disabled and nondisabled young people. All children seem to respond to the arts and have enormous creative potential. The arts have allowed children to explore their dreams, needs, their hopes and fears. The able-bodied, young person discovers dimensions of himself that may have been temporarily misplaced in tough, competitive games or rigid, academic rules. The disabled young person discovers a way to share his or her true abilities. Young people are also excited and surprised to find that crayons, paints, clay, and wood are limitless in their use.

It is sad that when Federal funding for education is cut, the arts are the first to go. It is sad that individualism and creativity are never quite as important as learning how to build bombs. We are immersed in high-powered technology and mass-produced living environments. Our society has rewarded people who are alike and teaches us to be embarrassed by our differences, even though many of our differences are what makes each of us special and should be celebrated.

The truth is that we really cannot afford to lose our differences, our individuality. If we are to have a rational world to live in, we must nourish and excite the minds and dreams of our children. We must encourage them to think and act in ways that rely on their inner resources. The arts provide a comfortable space to explore, expand, and enrich the ideas and discoveries of young minds as well as a way to express our different experiences and individual viewpoints.

In my work with myself and other disabled people, it seems clear to me that the arts have opened up areas of socialization and ac-

complishment for us. We have been able to express ourselves in ways that may not have been available to us otherwise. Through the arts, such people as myself, disabled people build self-confidence and gain better acceptance from ourselves and others because we are proving that we can succeed in an area that is important to all human beings.

When you go home tonight and enjoy your one-of-a-kind paintings and rugs and sculptures, please think of the artists who made them. Please think that with a teacher's encouragement and a student's eagerness to create, beauty has a real possibility for survival. Because without art, we would, indeed, be an uncivilized culture.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. That was an excellent statement.

Now can we have Dr. Paul Lehman up here? Come around, Dr. Lehman. We are glad to welcome you here this morning. Go ahead.

[Prepared statement of Paul R. Lehman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAUL R. LEHMAN, PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, SCHOOL OF MUSIC, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR; PRESIDENT-ELECT, MUSIC EDUCATORS NATIONAL CONFERENCE, RESTON, VA.

My name is Paul Lehman, and I am the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies of the School of Music of The University of Michigan. I am also the President-Elect of the Music Educators National Conference, and on July 1 I will begin a two-year term as President of that organization. I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here this morning and to share with you some of our views and concerns with respect to arts education in the United States.

The Music Educators National Conference (MENC) is an active, dynamic organization of more than fifty thousand members representing all fields of specialization who teach at all levels in music from preschool through graduate school. It conducts a variety of programs and activities to promote comprehensive music programs in all schools, based on effective instructional techniques and taught by highly qualified teachers. Its ultimate purpose is to build a vital musical culture and an enlightened musical public.

The most rewarding thing about being President of this exciting organization is the opportunity it gives one to become acquainted with music teachers and music programs across the nation. One thing has already become obvious to me: It is all but impossible to generalize about the state of music programs in the school.

When I look around I see that school music is flourishing as never before. The quality of the programs is superb. The quality of the teachers is outstanding. The level of student achievement is astonishing. The number of students involved is higher than ever.

But when I look again, in other communities, I see that we have serious problems. Music programs are being cut back, or sometimes even eliminated. Music teachers are being laid off. Budgets for materials and equipment are being reduced. And scheduling problems are making it impossible for some students to schedule music.

Next I have some suggestions for all of us, at all levels, who are interested in the arts. These are suggestions not only for those in government and those in arts education but also for state and local arts councils and for all of the many arts support groups that exist across the nation:

1. We should make it clear to those in charge of our schools that we expect them to include strong programs in the arts. The schools are ultimately responsive to the wishes of the public, and if this message is heard loudly enough and often enough it will be heeded.

2. We should monitor the arts programs in our schools to ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn a solid core of basic skills. Further, we should ensure that advanced training of high quality is available for the most talented students.

3. We should seek to build more and better bridges of cooperation and dialogue among the arts agencies and institutions, the arts education organizations, the arts support groups, and the schools. Some excellent beginnings have been made. Yet the

potential is so vast and so promising that finding ways to work together more effectively must be a high priority for all of us.

Finally, let me say categorically that despite the fact that we have serious problems in some communities, on balance, the level of music teaching in the nation's schools has never been higher than it is at this moment. The freshmen who enter The University of Michigan play better and know more about music than graduate students did twenty years ago. I think that is true everywhere, and it is due simply to the excellent work of the nation's music teachers. If all educators were doing as good a job as our music educators are doing, we would not have all the problems that are described in the various reports.

The most amazing thing about these two opposing perceptions is that they are both true! It is all true, both the good and the bad. It is the best of times; it is the worst of times. It is a time of opportunity, but it is also a time of very real hazards that are potentially damaging for arts education.

Perhaps the foremost of these hazards results from the lingering ambivalence in society about just how important the arts really are in education. Look, for example, at the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation at Risk." We at MENC are pleased that the Commission calls attention to the importance of the arts in the curriculum.[1] We wish the press coverage and the public discussion of this document reflected the emphasis it places on the arts.

At the same time, we are deeply disappointed that the Commission assigned the arts to a second tier of priority, clearly subordinate to the highest-ranked fields of study. In this respect, "A Nation at Risk" is sharply at odds with most other major reports, which have included the arts among the basics. Ernest Boyer, for example, says in "High School":

> The first curriculum priority is language. . . . The second curriculum priority is a core of common-learning—a program of required courses in literature, the arts, foreign language, history, civics, science, mathematics, technology, health—to extend the knowledge and broaden the perspective of every student. . . .
>
> [The arts] are the means by which a civilization can be measured. . . . [They] are an essential part of the human experience. They are not a frill. We recommend that all students study the arts. . . . These skills are no longer just desirable. They are essential if we are to survive together with stability and joy.[2]

In "The Paideia Proposal," Mortimer Adler writes:

> [There] are three areas of subject matter indispensable to basic schooling—language, literature, and the fine arts; mathematics and natural sciences; history, geography, and social studies. Why these three? They comprise the most fundamental branches of learning. No one can claim to be educated who is not reasonably well acquainted with all three.[3]

"Academic Preparation for College," the publication of the College Board, takes the firm position that all students should study the arts whatever their fields of study are to be, and that each student should undertake more intensive preparation in at least one specific field of the arts.[4] MENC believes that this preparation is important not only for the college-bound but for all students.

In "A Place Called School," John Goodlad stresses the necessity of including the arts in the elementary school curriculum and he explains fully and persuasively how to find the time for them:

> "Our data suggest that providing broad programs of study for children in elementary schools need not be at the expense of the so-called basics—reading, language, arts, and mathematics. . . . Why do we spend so much time debating . . . over which school subjects are basic and must be taught when we can have all of the major ones without sacrificing anybody's definition of basic? . . . To those legislators, school board members, and others who often sound as though they would deprive children of access in school to social attention to reading, writing, spelling and mathematics, let me say simply that the sacrifice is unnecessary. . . . It will just be necessary for the principals and teachers of some elementary schools—perhaps most—to become more effective in the allocation and use of time." [5]

---

[1] *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (Washington, D.C.; Department of Education, 1983), pp. 26–27.

[2] Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1983), pp. 85, 94, 97–98.

[3] Mortimer J. Adler, *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1982), pp. 22–24.

[4] *Academic Preparation for College:* What Students Need To Know and Be Able To Do (New York: The College Board, 1983), pp. 16–18.

[5] John I. Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1984), pp. 132, 134, 136.

As for the secondary level, Goodlad proposes that ten to fifteen percent of each student's program be devoted to the arts, and that another ten to twenty percent be reserved to develop and refine the student's interests and talents, which, of course, may include the arts.[6] These are not figures springing suddenly from his imagination. They represent a lifetime of study and reflection by one of our leading educational figures, and they are presented within the context of a comprehensive proposal for a balanced curriculum.

We believe it is obvious from examining the various reports those that are most through and thoughtfu', those that are best documented, and those that are based on field work also tend to be most strongly supportive of the arts. This has also been true historically. After all, virtually every individual or group that has made a major contribution to Western educational thought since Plato has included the arts among the basics. Even the Council for Basic Education, who may consider the nation's most respected and eloquent voice for the basics, unequivocally places the arts among the highest-priority subject-matter fields.[7]

All of this raises a very puzzling question. In view of the compelling rationale for including the arts in the curriculum, which has been stated so persuasively and so may times by so many respected leaders in so many fields, why is it there are still schools that lack strong arts programs? The reasons are obviously complex, and the excuses are as unconvincing as they are diverse.

We recognize that decisions to cut back arts programs or not to offer the arts are usually made for fiscal reasons. No one in a leadership role in education has suggested that arts program should be cut back or that this represents sound educational philosophy. Nevertheless, it does happen sometimes, and the unvarnished truth is that when it does, it is simply because the arts are not valued highly enough, whether by school administrators or by the public. This is a pity, because it often indicates merely that the people making the decisions have not themselves experienced challenging, rewarding, high-quality arts programs. As a result, the next generation is destined to be equally deprived of some of the greatest satisfaction that life has to offer. But it is simply a matter of what our priorities are.

Let me now share with you some positions recently adopted by the National Executive Board of MENC, and then offer some suggestions about what can be done to improve the situation.

1. MENC supports efforts to improve the quality of American education at every level and in every phase of the curriculum. Further, we support efforts to develop more rigorous and measurable standards for education in all fields.

Each elementary and secondary school should undertake to implement, in stages if necessary, the specific recommendations of MENC with respect to curriculum, staff, scheduling, physical facilities, and materials and equipment as presented in "The School Music Program: Description and Standards." [8]

Teachers should be fully qualifed, not merely legally certified, in the specific subjects they are assigned to teach.

2. MENC supports efforts to raise the standards for admission to higher education and to ensure that each college or university student possesses knowledge and skill in the arts. . . .

3. Offerings in the arts should not be reduced or jeopardized in efforts to increase graduation requirements or improve the quality of other offerings at the secondary level. Specifically, there should be sufficient flexibility in the curriculum and a sufficient number of periods in the school day to provide a balanced program in music and the arts.

The school day should be extended, when necessary, to ensure that all students have the opportunity to elect courses in the arts.[9]

Now I would like to offer some suggestions. I have three suggestions for music educators, three suggestions for the Congress, and three suggestions for everyone who is interested in the arts.

We as music educators should do the following things:

1. We need to be certain that every music program in every school is balanced, rigorous, and of the highest quality. This is so obvious that it scarcely deserves mention, but it remain the most fundamental step we can take. Quality by itself, of course, is no guarantee against cutbacks. We have all seen excellent programs that have been cut back. But in the final analysis, our first line of defense must be a

---

[6] Goodlad, pp. 163, 287.

[7] "The Time for Basic Education," *Basic Education* 25 (March 1981): 3–5.

[8] Reston, Virgina: Music Educators National Conference, 1974.

[9] "Resolution of the National Executive Board of Music Educators National Conference," *Music Educators Journal* 70 (February 1984): 12–13.

high quality program, and one that serves a large percentage of the school population.

2. We need to stop doing things that contribute to the perception that music is a frill. We must avoid, for example overemphasis on popular music, on entertainment, and on competition. All of these can play a role in our programs, but we cannot allow them to be perceived by the public as the basis for the music curriculum.

3. We need to do a better job of informing the public of the value of our work and how well we are doing it. Each March, MENC sponsors "Music In Our Schools Week," during which music teachers utilize every existing opportunity and create new ones to publicize their programs. This is very helpful, but what is required is a fifty-two-week effort. We must organize a concerted, continuous, and well planned program in public relations directed toward building a solid base of support at every level.

I pledge to you that the efforts and energies of MENC, the largest of the subject-matter professional education associations in the nation, will be directed toward those objectives in the coming months and years. There is much to be done and we welcome the challenge that faces us.

Next, I have some suggestions of things that the Congress can do on behalf of arts education:

1. We urge Congress to ensure that any discipline-specific legislation that emerges includes the arts. By that, I mean legislation that confers benefits in certain fields of study and not in others. This might include legislation dealing with teacher education, research and development, preparation of instructional materials, scholarships and loans, loan forgiveness, master teacher programs, and so forth.

We recognize, for example, the evidence of private-sector competition for talent and personnel in certain fields that has led to suggestions of preferential treatment for teachers in those fields, but we believe that quality is important in all of our teachers, not merely in some of them, and we certainly do not concede that among the subjects of basic education any are more basic than any others. Every student, without exception, needs assured access to the arts no less than assured access to math and science. The reason has nothing to do with career choices in the arts any more than it has to do with career choices in math and science. It is merely that all three fields are equally indispensable components of human development.

2. We urge that Congress provide a level of support for arts education that will make it possible to conduct the same range and number of supportive programs that the National Science Foundation conducts in science education. These programs may be administered by the National Endowment for the Arts, by the Department of Education, or through some joint cooperative effort. We recognize that in the past, the Arts Endowment has not been noted for its interest in arts education, but we have found the present leadership of the Endowment ready to address these issues, and we very much appreciate their willingness to do so.

We believe, for example, that a program of summer workshops for the in-service education of arts teachers would be a particularly helpful step. We are aware that confusion concerning the role of the Arts Endowment and the Department of Education have constituted a barrier to such programs at times in the past, but such confusion need not exist and, in fact, has not existed in the case of the summer fellowship program of the National Endowment for the Humanities or numerous educational programs of the National Science Foundation. What is important if such programs are to be effective, we believe, is that they are planned in cooperation with the arts education organizations. In the American educational system, as we all know, it is the private sector that sets the standards, not a Ministry of Education. The voluntary subject-matter associations represent the collective expertise of our professions. We welcome the opportunity to bring this valuable resource to the solution of these problems.

3. We urge Congress to use the prestige and influence of the federal government is support of the arts and arts education at every opportunity. We are especially grateful for the continuing leadership of the Congressional Arts Caucus in this matter.

It is particularly unfortunate that in discussions concerning the arts in the United States the role of the elementary and secondary schools and the colleges and universities is typically overlooked. When speaking of support for the arts most people naturally think first of the public and private funds going to the symphony orchestras; the opera, theatre, and dance companies; and the art galleries. But in fact, the subsidies for arts education provided by the nation's schools and colleges, inadequate as they are in some instances, still represent a massive and unparalleled contribution to the arts. And when we think in the broadest sense of the fundamen-

tal, long-term role of the arts in our national life, it seems evident that no institutions or agencies are of greater importance than our schools and colleges.

Some critics view teachers as part of the problem. Any plans for reform proceeding from this assumption is certain to fail. Teachers must be part of the solution, not part of the problem. Otherwise there is no solution, because there is no one else who can implement it.

We hear complaints about the poor quality of some music programs. There are some poor ones, but for every weak program there are several strong ones. Although we have suffered cutbacks in some localities excellence in arts education is still so widely dispersed that I can identify for you outstanding music program in every Congressional district in the United States. I would welcome the opportunity to escort personally any member of this Committee or any member of the House or Senate on a visit to some of these outstanding programs. There you will see young people demonstrating learning that will serve them admirably as long as they live, and you will see superb teaching by dedicated and hard-working men and women.

We should remember that, one way or another, people will always want to learn the arts. Because of their fundamental role in civilization, because of their unique ability to exalt the human spirit and enhance the quality of life, and because of their enduring capacity to enthrall and delight human beings and to transform the human experience, the arts are destined to play a major role in society as far into the future as anyone can see. The only question is whether we want to limit access to the arts to an elite or whether we want to make them available to all of our citizens to appreciate and enjoy to the fullest. I believe that the answer is clear.

Again, I pledge the help and support of MENC in confronting the difficult challenges that face American education. The skill and knowledge of our members represents a vast and unique pool of expertise waiting to the tapped. We stand ready to assist in any way that we can.

Thank you very much for allowing me to appear before you this morning and to offer these remarks.

Dr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Paul Lehman and I am the associate dean for graduate studies at the school of music at the University of Michigan. I might also add that I am a former member of the faculty of the University of Kentucky and I certainly enjoyed very much the years I spent there.

Chairman PERKINS. When did you leave Kentucky?

Dr. LEHMAN. 1970.

I am also the president-elect of the Music Educators National Conference [MENC], and on July 1 I will begin a 2-year term as president of that organization.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here this morning and to share with you some of our ideas and concerns with respect to arts education.

MENC is an active organization of more than 50,000 members representing all fields of specialization in music and teaching at all levels from the preschool through the graduate school. The most exciting thing, I think, about being president of this exciting organization is the opportunity it gives one to become acquainted with music teachers and music programs across the country.

There is one thing that has already become obvious to me and that is that it's all but impossible to generalize about the state of music in the schools. When I look around I see that school music is flourishing. The quality of the programs is superb. The quality of the teachers is outstanding. The levels of student achievement are astonishing and the numbers of students involved are higher than ever.

But when I look again in other communities, I see that we have serious problems. We have music programs that are being cut back or even eliminated. We have music teachers that are being laid off.

33-785 O - 84 - 3

Budgets for materials and equipment are being reduced and sometimes scheduling problems are even making it impossible for students to schedule music. The most amazing thing about these two opposed perceptions is that they are both true. All of this is true, both the good and the bad. It is certainly a time of opportunity, but it's a time of challenge also.

I think that perhaps the foremost hazard among the hazards that face the arts these days is a lingering ambivalence within society about just how important the arts in education really are. Look, for example, at the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation At Risk." Those of us in arts education are very pleased that the Commission called attention to the arts in the curriculum. We wish that the press coverage and the public discussion of this document had reflected the emphasis that it places on the arts.

At the same time, though, we are deeply disappointed that the Commission assigned the arts to a second tier of priorities, clearly subordinate to the highest ranked fields of study. In this respect, "A Nation At Risk" is sharply at odds with most of the other reports and studies that have appeared. In my written statement that I submit for the record, I have cited some evidence from these various documents to support this claim.

I will just call attention to the fact that virtually every important individual or group that has made a major contribution to Western educational thought since Plato has included the arts among the highest ranked fields of study.

I would like to devote my remaining time to offering a few suggestions. I have three suggestions for my colleagues in music education. I have three suggestions for the Congress and I have three suggestions for all of us who are interested in arts education.

The things that we as music educators can do are these. First of all, we need to make sure that every music program in every school is balanced and of the highest quality. Now that is so obvious that it scarcely deserves mention. But it's something that we have not always paid enough attention to.

Second, we need to stop doing things that contribute to the perception that music is a frill. For example, we need to avoid excessive emphasis on music as entertainment, excessive emphasis on competitions in music, excessive emphasis, perhaps, on popular music. All of these things are useful and have a place in our program. But when the public perceives that they have become the basis for the program, then we are in serious trouble.

Third, we need to do a better job of informing the public of the value of our work and of how well we are doing it. Each March, MENC sponsors "Music in our Schools Week," during which time we try to take advantage of every conceivable opportunity to gain visibility for our program. This is effective, but, of course, we need an effort that extends through 52 weeks, not simply 1 week. Well, these are the things that we as music educators can do and I pledge the efforts and energies of MENC over the coming months and years to the achievement of these objectives.

Next I have some suggestions of things that the Congress can do on behalf of arts education. First of all, we urge that the Congress insure that any discipline-specific that emerges provides for the

arts. I mean by that legislation that confers benefits in some fields of study and not in others. We are well aware of the evidence of private sector competition for talented personnel in certain fields that has lead to suggestions of preferential treatment for teachers in those fields, but we think that quality is important in all of our teachers, not merely in some of them and we certainly do not concede that among the fields of basic education, there are some fields that are more basic than others.

Second, we urge that the Congress provide a level of support for arts education that will make it possible to conduct the same range and volume of supportive programs that the National Science Foundation conducts in science education. These kinds of programs can be administered either through the National Endowment for the Arts or through the Department of Education or through some joint cooperative effort. We recognize that in the past the Arts Endowment has not been particularly noted for its interest in arts education, but we have found the present leadership of the Endowment to be quite open to addressing these issues and we very much appreciate their willingness to do so.

We agree, for example, that a program of summer workshops for the in-service education of arts teachers would be a very helpful step. What's important, we think, is that any programs of this type, if they are to be successful, need to be planned in conjunction or in cooperation with the arts education agency. The reason for that is simply that in our system, as we all know, it is the private sector that sets the standards, it is not a ministry of education. These voluntary subject matter organizations represent the collective wisdom, the collective expertise in our profession and we welcome the opportunity to bring to bear this valuable resource on these problems.

Third, we urge the Congress to use the prestige and influence of the Federal Government on behalf of the arts and arts education at every opportunity. We are especially grateful for the continuing leadership of the Congressional Arts Caucus in this matter.

Next I have some suggestions for all of us who are interested in arts education at every level and this includes not only those in Government and those in arts education, but also the State arts councils, local arts councils, and all of the many arts support groups that exist across the country.

First of all, we should make it clear to those that are in charge of our schools that we expect them to include strong programs in the arts within their curriculum. The schools, ultimately, are responsive to the public and we think that if this message is heard loudly enough and often enough that it will be heeded.

Second, we need to monitor the arts programs in our schools to make certain that every student has the opportunity to learn a solid core of basic skills and knowledge in the arts.

Further, we need to make sure that every school provides advanced training of high quality for the most talented students.

Third, we need to build more and better bridges of cooperation and dialog between the arts institutions and agencies, the arts education organizations, the art support groups and the schools. We have made some excellent beginnings in this respect. But the opportunity is so vast, the potention is so great, that finding more ef-

fective ways to work together needs to be a high priority for all of us.

Finally, let me say that despite the serious problems we have in some communities, on balance, in my opinion, the level of teaching in the Nation's schools has never been higher than it is at this moment. The freshmen who enroll at the University of Michigan play better and know more about music than the graduate students did 20 years ago. I observed the same thing when I taught at the University of Kentucky and I think that's true everywhere. It is due simply to the efforts of the Nation's music educators.

As a matter of fact, if all educators were doing as good a job as our music educators are doing, we would not have all of the problems that are described in these various reports. Some critics view teachers as a part of the problem, but the fact is that any plan that proceeds from that assumption is bound to fail. Teachers have to be viewed as part of the solution, not part of the problem. Otherwise there is no solution because there is no one else who can implement it.

Now we often hear complaints about the poor quality of some of our programs and, certainly, there are weak programs. There is no denying that. But for every weak program, there are several strong programs. Despite the difficulties I have alluded to, excellence in arts education is still so widely dispersed across the Nation that I can identify for you, Mr. Chairman, outstanding arts programs in every congressional district in the United States. I would welcome the opportunity to escort personally any member of this committee or any Member of the House or Senate on a visit to some of these outstanding programs.

There you would see students demonstrating learning that will serve them admirably for as long as they live. You will see superb teaching by dedicated, hard working men and women. We need to remember that one way or another, people are always going to want to learn the arts. The only question is whether we want to limit access to the arts to an elite or whether we want to make them available for all of our citizens to enjoy and appreciate to the fullest. I think the answer is clear.

Again, I pledge the help and support of the Music Educators National Conference in confronting these difficult challenges. I believe that the skill and knowledge of our members represents a vast and unique pool of expertise that is waiting to be tapped. We stand ready to assist in any way we can.

Thank you again for allowing me to be here this morning and to offer these remarks.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you, Mr. Hodsoll, do you feel that there is a need for additional Federal funding to encourage arts education at the elementary and secondary schools?

Mr. HODSOLL. I don't know the answer to that, Mr. Chairman, at this time. We are taking a look at what moneys are available to see whether or not there are adequate sums that can be disbursed into the arts area. I just don't have a view on it at this point.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask Dr. Lehman—I am going across the table—do you feel that we need additional funds at the elementary and secondary level and if we do, who should administer it? The Office of Education or the Endowment for the Arts?

Dr. LEHMAN. I think the answer to your first question is, "Yes, there is a need for additional support," and I would call attention to the range and number of programs in science education that are supported by the National Science Foundation. I think we need something parallel in the arts.

As for who should administer these, I am not sure. I have no answer to that. I think it would need to be explored further between the agencies involved. I think the Arts Endowment is a possibility, the Department of Education is a possibility and there may be other possibilities or some joint effort.

Chairman PERKINS. Ms. Summers, let me ask you a question after that excellent testimony this morning.

Ms. SUMMERS. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Is there enough, in your judgment, being done for arts education under the new education block grant which replaced the former categorical arts program?

Ms. SUMMERS. No, I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. I think that it's much more effective to have a direct amount of funding appropriated for the certain arts programs. I think that some people might not be well aware of how important it is to allocate money for the arts and get a little confused about how to appropriate the moneys.

I would like to add that I work with the National Committee on Arts for the Handicapped. I am their special projects assistant.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Jeffords, you being one of the great leaders in this area, you go ahead. Take as much time as you want.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I deeply appreciate you holding these hearings. The reason I asked Congressman Downey for these hearings is to bring out the problems which Ms. Summers just related. Just at a time when we have declining resources there is a tendency to eliminate funding for items such as the arts because of the strict financial problems that are faced at the local level. I am concerned that there seems to be a decreasing amount of money being spent on the arts and humanities under the block grant.

I think it's critically important that at the national level we appreciate and understand how important to our society it is that we do not allow those things which are the best indication of what your society is bringing forth of benefit to the people through the arts, to be neglected through these difficult times.

I am sorry I got here late. Unfortunately, at this time, we have several hearings to attend. I wanted to be here from the beginning. You asked some excellent questions, Mr. Chairman, which took care of those that I was going to ask. Your last question regarding what is going on out in the real world with respect to the arts funding and expenditure of funds, as a result of the budget, was especially pertinent. I wonder if Dr. Lehman and Mr. Hodsoll would give me any further information they might have as to what is occurring with respect to the declining availability of funds in these areas around the country.

Mr. HODSOLL. Well, Mr. Jeffords, in that part of my testimony which I did not do orally for the record, we did bring together some statistics, not so much as to funding, but as to what appears to be going on out there in terms of actual arts education programs. The

studies are mixed. Some indicate that in 1980 and 1981, for example, there were increases in arts education. Others indicate that there were decreases. I don't think we have a good sense of that. There's certainly no question that there are stringencies in terms of funding of education at the elementary and secondary levels. That's clear.

The impact on arts education is less clear, at least to me.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you. Dr. Lehman.

Dr. LEHMAN. I think this is essentially correct. The picture is very, very mixed. You go to some parts of the country—I was in the State of Wisconsin last month and everything is fine there. They are doing very well. You talk to people in other parts of the country and you find there are serious difficulties. So, it really is just a matter of who you talk with and what part of the country you are dealing with.

Mr. JEFFORDS. In other words, right now we don't have the kind of data that are necessary to give us a clear indication of what's happening?

Dr. LEHMAN. That's precisely correct. The Music Educators National Conference is undertaking a project to try to gather some more accurate data and we hope that with time we will be able to do that. We certainly look forward to the results of the study that's being undertaken by the Arts Endowment because this should be extraordinarily helpful.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you.

Laureen, I am sorry I missed what I know was a very moving presentation. My main concern, at least the emphasis I would like to play upon, is the importance of the arts, especially in those areas where people really need and have a desire to participate in the arts, but where the arts tend to be neglected. This situation exists in the ghettos and with regard to the handicapped and others. I appreciate very much your assistance in focusing attention on that area which, I think, is so important to our society.

I think it is so critical that we demonstrate in the ghetto areas and also to handicapped individuals, who have a difficult time in our society anyway, that there is something to live for other than standing in a food stamp line and that there is something that they do meaningfully to have productive lives. We must assure them that our society can make this opportunity available to them. If you have any comments along those lines, I would certainly like to hear them.

Ms. SUMMERS. Well, in my work with the National Committee for the Handicapped, I have seen amazing things happen when we have reached out to disabled and poor people and given them the opportunity. It's like, "Here's all these things. Let's see what you can do." People really yearn for that opportunity to explore on their own and amazing results have happened. People have become much more productive just because they feel better about themselves. They begin to want to succeed. They begin to want to get out of whatever unhappy situation they are in because they have found something they can do, they like to do, they are encouraged to do. For this reason alone I think the arts have been crucial in allowing people to become more productive contributors to society.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have long been interested in arts education for the handicapped. I also know that because of the decreasing funds available generally there is pressure which is inhibiting the general education of handicapped people in this country. I wonder if you have any indication that the general restriction of the availability of funds is going to diminish the availability of programs in the arts because of the need to emphasize more basic education?

Ms. SUMMERS. Yes; I think that is happening. I think people have given much more importance to providing therapy for handicapped kids than anything else and I think it's sad because they are coming out of our schools with not a whole lot of enthusiasm and not being able to do very much. With a limited amount of funds, of course, you have to place them where you think the child will benefit and, in many cases for the disabled child, it is very, very basic education and therapy and not a whole lot of fun things to do.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement that I would like placed in the record.

Chairman PERKINS. You go ahead. Without objection, the gentleman's statement will be inserted in the record.

[Prepared statement of Cong. James M. Jeffords follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

On behalf of all concerned participants in the arts and the education communities, I would like to thank Chairman Perkins for holding this hearing. We are here to discuss ways in which to strengthen the role of art in elementary and secondary education.

I would also like to thank our four distinguished witnesses. We are fortunate to hear testimony from those who are fully aware of the state of the arts in our nation's schools, as well as from those who actually perform for and teach art to our children.

The timing of this hearing is crucial. With all the discussion of improving our nation's public education, and with task forces on school reform now active in 45 states, it is essential that we discuss how the arts can be included in these reforms and improvements.

There are various ways in which children can be taught to learn about and to appreciate art. We therefore need to decide what ways are best. We are here to uncover the issues that we must address in order to enhance the role of art in our children's education. We are laying the groundwork for legislation that will address these issues.

We are beyond the point of merely recognizing that the arts are currently being left out of discussions on education. I know that in my own state of Vermont, the arts education community recently completed an experiment that indicated the interest of students and teachers in arts education.

Last summer, the Vermont Department of Education and the Vermont Council on the Arts sponsored the Governor's Institute on the Arts. This institute was a program in which 236 junior high and high school students participated in intensive artistic training program held at Castleton State College. Four students from each of the 59 superintendencies in Vermont were selected. The program was designed to talented students who had little opportunity to express themselves in their usual school curriculums. The students were taught by professional artists who were selected on the basis of application specifically to to this program. Half were from within Vermont, half were from out of state.

In addition to providing intensive artistic training to students, the artists held workshops for about 25 art teachers from the public school system. These workshops were an attempt to help shape the artistic curriculums within the schools

By all accounts, the program was a tremendous success. Feedback from the students, obtained from the actual journals they kept throughout the experience, was outstandingly positive. Teachers and school administrators also reacted very favorably, and were quite frankly shocked at the level of interest from the students. The

important point to note is that teachers administrators and parents all admitted there is a great interest in arts education that they did not know existed.

There is also a lesson in the funding of this program. With a total budget of almost $130,000, the great majority of funds came from private sources. Together, the Vermont Council on the Arts and the Vermont Department of Education financed about 20% of the total. The rest came from private schools, businesses and individuals. The lesson here is that public funds can be used as seed money to spur private involvement in arts education.

Plans are well underway to hold the program again this summer. There is currently more than enough interest thoughout Vermont to get it off the ground.

Vermont's experience is an example of one way in which to put the arts back into our children's education. Although, the Governor's Institute on the Arts did reach all corners of Vermont, only a small portion of Vermonters were directly involved. Yet it clearly indicated there is interest for both participation in and financial support of arts education. We clearly need to find ways to involve more interested students and teachers in programs such as this one. We need to find ways to enhance the education of many more children.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Again, I want to thank you most sincerely for this opportunity to focus upon what I think is a critical problem in the country and that is that we do not allow the emphasis on the arts and the humanities to be neglected as we move forward through a very difficult financial period.

Chairman PERKINS. Well, I want to concur in everything you have stated, Mr. Jeffords. The hearing, in my judgment, was timely and we do not want to overlook the arts. Even though it's been block granted, we want to make sure that they receive adequate funding to carry out our true purposes. If necessary, we will hold further hearings in the future. We want to keep this program going. It serves a very useful purpose.

I want to compliment all of you witnesses this morning. You have been helpful. I am hopeful that the public can read a portion of your testimony. I thank all of you very much.

The committee is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:23 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. TOM DOWNEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for providing this opportunity for public discussion of the role of the arts in education and ways to strengthen this vital component in our Nation's education system.

As Chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I am particularly pleased with this opportunity, because arts education is a major issue on the agenda of the Caucus. The distinguished Vice-Chairman of the Arts Caucus, Jim Jeffords, also a Member of the full Committee, has encouraged Caucus involvement and has led our efforts in this important area.

As Arts Caucus Members, we are extemely aware of the critical role played by artistic exposure and training in the education of our young people. Several of the recent reports on our country's educational system have recognized the arts as a "basic," but unfortunately, others either fail to mention the arts or merely consider them as supplementary to the curriculum.

At a time when the issue of education is high on the public agenda, this inconsistency on the appropriate role of the arts must be corrected. Today's hearing provides a beginning in the process of full public acceptance of the arts as a basic in education.

The College Board includes the arts in its core curriculum of "six academic subjects" and states that preparation in the arts is valuable for all students entering college. The Board stresses that practice of the arts can "engage the imagination, foster flexible ways of thinking, develop disciplined effort, and build self-confidence," while "appreciation of the arts is integral to the understanding of other cultures . . ." In his four-year study, "A Place Called School: Prospects for the

Future," John Goodlad agrees that the arts are a "basic," and calls them one of the "Five fingers of human knowledge."

Participation in the arts helps our children develop the higher levels of skill, literacy, and training enabling them to function more effectively within our society. In addition, an education in the arts offers students a unique and essential understanding of our world's diverse cultures. Without this understanding, our many international problems will remain unsolved.

Although just a beginning, this hearing does indicate that Congress recognizes the need to examine the role of the arts in our Nation's schools. Concerns and ideas presented today will help this Subcommittee, as well as other concerned Members, to clarify the role of our government in strengthening arts education and to make specific steps in formulating pertinent legislation.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education stated that our National was at risk with the "rising tide of mediocrity" present in our educational system. As we take steps to stem this tide, let us not leave behind the lifesaving elements that the arts have provided for all civilizations throughout history.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JIM MOODY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify before your Subcommittee on "The Role of Arts in Education." These hearings are timely given the increased publicity devoted to the imperative for strong mathematics and science curricula. Consequently, we must not overlook the critical contributions of a solid arts education to a well-rounded mind.

A 1982 Gallup poll indicated that American people placed great importance on public funding for education—even greater importance than on public support for health care, welfare and military issues. And in "A National at Risk: The imperative for Educational Reform", the report compiled by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, several valuable recommendations were proposed which seek to rectify our present educational malaise. Because of this increasing national concern with our educational system, I stress the need for a concerted effort at all levels—federal, state, local, educators and students—to promote and maintain arts in the educational process as a necessary component for enriching a well-balanced education.

Arts are as much a "basic" to everyone's training as mathematics and science. Unfortunately, they are frequently short shifted because critics argue that in many instances, there are no tangible results to be gained. This is a narrow minded view. Aside from the readily visible skills and talent achieved with some art studies, many creative applications of an arts education are equally important but less apparent, being disseminated through other learning experiences and indirectly enhancing the overall result.

It is a proven fact that federal funding serves as a catalyst to stimulate private sector funding. Nowhere is that more applicable than in education. Federal funding of the arts in education is necessary to foster and maintain an active participation on state and local levels. Most importantly though, schools remain the primary source for encouraging an interest in the arts—an interest that allows for an unparalleled exposure to the arts for students who may never have similar opportunities after completing their formal educations.

Educators, parents and students must pursue the goal of a well-rounded, high quality education that surpasses "minimum requirements" in any field of endeavor. Mr. Chairman, achievement of this goal requires a continued congressional commitment to excellence in education—a commitment that fully appreciates and supports the role of arts in education.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CARDISS COLLINS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND CHAIRWOMAN, HOUSE GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

We are very pleased that the House Education and Labor Committee has launched hearings on "The Role of the Arts in Education," with a promise of legislative activity to follow.

Last summer, our Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee began an extensive investigation of the interrelationship of funding for the arts at the federal, state and local levels. Education was a major thrust of this review, along with the impact of the arts on the economy, employment and audience development.

In our report (issued November 15, 1983 by the Committee on Government Operations), it is noted that Congress first stipulated in 1978 that "the arts should be an essential and vital component for every student's education." However, "in reality, the federal mandate for arts education was dropped in 1981 when 29 separate programs were folded into a basic block grant program. States were given full discretion on how the funding should be reallocated." (p. 29)

Our subcommittee determined that "without the vital encouragement of the arts at the federal level, the arts in the schools have quickly disappeared as a necessary part of the educational process at the state and local levels. For many children, the schools constitute their only exposure to the arts since their families lack the financial, educational, intellectual and physical resources to provide such opportunities . . .

"While schools have a key role in the arts' education process, this function is also transmitted by tandem efforts with libraries, art galleries, museums and science centers," the report noted.

"Some observers reject the arts as worthy of inclusion in the school curriculum, opting for 'the basics' of math, science and computers, without 'the frills' of plays, music, poetry or painting. Still others see arts education as a pay-as-you go process, ignoring the fact that admission fees eliminate many from such enjoyment.

"Appreciation of the arts—both as an individual and as a part of a larger audience—does not necessarily mean knowing the differences between a Rembrandt, a Renoir or a Rotho painting. It is, in essence, the opportunity for exposures to new and varied experiences which stimulate creativity and an awareness of the unique visons portrayed by each artist and witnessed differently by each listener/viewer/participant in the artistic process," the report emphasized.

Among the recommendations we would urge your committee to consider are:

1. Reinstatement of the 1978 Elementary and Secondary Education Act provision that declared that the "arts should be an essential and vital component for every student's education" as part of the federal arts policy.

2. Review of the Cooperative Resources Act, first funded in 1957 and subsequently incorporated into Title III and Title IV amendments to the ESEA, to provide theater and music exposure to all students. This program should be re-enacted on a matching fund basis for state and local school districts.

3. Expansion by the National Endowment for the Arts of touring programs in order to bring the arts to a broader geographical and social spectrum, with an emphasis on the educational component for school audiences.

4. Recognition of the fact that federal dollars are the catalyst that stimulate the state and local sectors in funding for the arts in the schools. States can develop their own educational programs for the arts in partnership with the federal government. Such programs would allow each school and school district a degree of autonomy as well as autonomy for the local teacher who supervises the classroom instruction. The local level can provide the innovations while the federal level offers a degree of national consistency in quality, content and evaluation.

5. To provide greater exposure to the arts for students outside of a classroom setting, the National Endowments, in conjunction with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies should work to obtain student discount tickets through half-price outlets which are found in major cities such as New York, Washington, D.C. and Chicago.

6. Through the schools, the federal mandate expressed in the guidelines for the National Endowment for the Arts can be most fully reached. The stated goal of NEA is:

"To insure that all Americans have a true opportunity to make an informed, educated choice to have the arts of high quality touch their lives so that no person is deprived of access to the arts by reason of goegraphy, inadequate income, inadequate education, physical or mental handicaps, or social or cultural patterns unresponsive to diverse ethnic needs."

Our subcommittee urges bipartisan teamwork to help provide exposure to all students at all levels so that arts education is a reality, not merely a distant goal.

Thank you for allowing me to submit these remarks.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHARLES B. FOWLER, CONSULTANT IN THE ARTS AND EDUCATION, EDITOR OF MUSICAL AMERICA/HIGH FIDELITY MAGAZINE

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I have served in numerous capacities in the field of arts and education for the past 30 years. Never have I seen it in such a sorry state or so in need of assistance.

I want to focus my testimony on six recent educational studies and reports and their implications for the arts in education [see list attached]. While fairly consistent about English, mathematics, science, and other "academic" subjects, these reports, taken together, present widely conflicting and confusing accounts of the arts and their value and place in American schools. Their recommendations regarding the arts are no less than chaotic. Some examples:

While the report of the College Entrance Examination Board proposes a core curriculum comprised of six "basic academic subjects"—English, mathematics, science, social studies, foreign languages, and the arts, "A Nation At Risk," the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, recommends a curriculm comprises of "Five New Basics"—English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science. The arts are not included. The fine and performing arts, the Commission says, are areas that "complement the New Basics."

In contrast, the reports of the Twentieth Century Fund and the Education Commission of the States do not mention the arts once in their entirety, though they make strong recommendations regarding the need for higher quality programs in English, mathematics, science, and other subjects.

Then again, John Goodlad's four-year study calls for a balanced curriculum based upon the "five fingers" of human knowledge, one of them, the arts. Similarly, Ernest Boyer's study of the high school includes the arts as part of "a core of common learning."

Three of these reports, then, consider the arts basic; one views them as a "complement" to the basics, whatever that infers; and two others, by omitting them altogether, convey the idea that they are of no importance whatsoever.

But there are even deeper confusions here. On the one hand, some of the reports view the arts as important areas of study for all students; on the other, it appears that there are those who still believe that the arts are areas of study reserved for the talented or those intent on careers in the arts, that is, as vocational training. Should we have arts for the *few* or arts for the *many*? [In my way of thinking, we don't study the arts just to become artists any more than we study mathematics to become mathematicians.]

There are also confusions in these reports concerning how academic the arts should be. The College Board views them as largely academic. It recommends that college entrants develop knowledge and skills "in at least one art form" that cover the broad range of history, theory, criticism, and performance. The National Commission recommends that the arts require "rigorous effort" and that "they should demand the same level of performance as the Basics." The Education Commission of the States recommends that schools "eliminate 'soft,' non-essential courses," implying, one can surmise, that if the arts are to remain, they must be taught as academic disciplines.

There seems to be consistent agreement here that the arts should become more academic. But oddly enough, Goodlad found in his observations of arts classes at all levels that one of their worst qualities was precisely when they emulated the so-called academic subjects. He says:

"I am disappointed with the degree to which arts classes appear to be dominated by the ambience of English, mathematics, and other academic subjects. Arts classes, too, appear to be governed by characteristics which are best described as "school"—following the rules, finding the one right answer, practicing the lower cognitive processes."

In which direction should the arts move—to become more academic like the other subjects or to seek to retain our possible differences?

The reports also disagree as to whether the arts should be considered important for college entrance. The College Board views the arts as "valuable" to college students "whatever their intended field of study," a marked turnabout for an organization that has long maintained testing for college admission based upon scores in verbal, mathematical, and scientific skills.

In contrast, the National Commission's report states that:

"Four-year colleges and universities should raise their admissions requirements and advise all potential applicants of the standards for admissions in terms of specific courses, performance in these areas, and levels of achievement on standardized

achievement tests in each of the five Basics and, where applicable, foreign languages."

No mention of the arts. We know from long experience that high schools teach what is tested. Achievement tests are prescriptive; they determine curricula, and they tell students and teachers what is important and what is not. By *not* counting the arts important for college entrance, the Commission consigns them, deliberately or naively, to an inferior status.

Further, the educational potential of the arts is seriously underestimated. Most of these reports enlist education in the economic battle to keep America competitive in global markets. For example, "A Nation At Risk" states that, "Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological *innovation* is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world." The Education Commission of the States declares that "our faith in ourselves as the world's supreme *innovators*—is being shaken." Increasingly, this task force says, jobs that offer upward mobility will be "those which require the *creative* use of technology." [Emphasis mine.]

Yet, with so much expressed concern for the development of innovation and creativity in these reports, it is ironical that they do not make the obvious connection to the arts. I doubt seriously whether this nation can remain the world's leader in technological inventiveness without investing in the creative development of our young minds. It seems so utterly shortsighted to want to remain competitive in this technological world yet not realize that the arts encourage people to be innovative and to value their creative selves. After all, we don't learn to be creative in spelling, math, science, or history.

I submit that these six reports are sending confusing signals to the American public, to state legislators, to schcol boards, to administrators and teachers, and to educational organizations regarding the role and value of the arts in education. Depending upon which reports gain prominence, the arts could become central to education or be even further relegated to the educational sidelines. The point is: These same studies are not sending confusing signals about English, math, science, social studies, even foreign languages and computer science. Necessarily, the arts education profession is left to ponder the questions: What might be sacrificed in the rush to produce more scientists and mathematicians? In our haste to make curricular changes, will we forget that there are lots of different kinds of kids out there? What kinds of opportunities for learning truly enable children to develop their fullest potential?

I submit, too, that in this time of great pressures for educational change, arts education appears to be nearly helpless. The arts are the minority subjects in American education, and we suffer all the attendant problems associated with the disadvantaged—neglect, isolation, poverty, high unemployment, and powerlessness.

We have great need to bring our best minds together and straighten out the scrambled picture of the arts presented in these reports. But we don't so much as have a cent to call our people together. I think we desperately need to hammer out a rationale and an agenda for the arts in education for the 80's. We need to formulate a clear and convincing case for the arts in education. We need to draft a vision to guide us, one that will led us in entering the educational dialogues that are certain to result from all these studies.

Our field is shattered and demoralized, and this couldn't have been clearer than at the recent conference on "The Future of Musical Education in America" held at the Eastman School of Music. I never saw so much anguish released in any professional meeting in arts education. We need our own "A Nation At Risk," or, better, "A Common Cause for the Arts." And we need it as soon as possible if we are going to make certain that the arts continue to command a share of the increasingly competitive market for the minds of American youth.

EDUCATION STUDIES AND REPORTS—1983

Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do, a report of the Educational Equality Project of the College Entrance Examination Board; Order #239200, College Board Publications, Dept. A35, Box 886, New York, NY 10101; $20 for 20 copies.

Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools (The Task Force on Education for Economic Growth of the Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln, #300, Denver, Colorado 80295), $5.00.

A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, a report to the nation and the secretary of education of the U.S. Department of Education by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983. $4.50. Stock No. 065-000-00177-2. Su-

perintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Boyer, Ernest L. *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers), $15.00.

Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984), $18.95.

Making the Grade: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy (The Twentieth Century Fund, 41 East 70th Street, New York, NY 10021, 1983), $6.00. More than 10, $5.50; more than 30, $5.00.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, ARTS WITH THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, The National Committee, Arts With the Handicapped is pleased to submit written testimony regarding your interest in the role of the arts in education and the value of this important curriculum area to our nation's able-bodied and disabled children and youth.

This year, National Committee, Arts With the Handicapped, an Educational Affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, celebrates its tenth birthday with pride. With only a modest federal contribution in past years, NCAH has enhanced the education of hundreds of thousands of disabled persons of all ages, added richness to their lives and broadened their communication through music, drama, dance and the visual arts. Growing financial support from the private sector and the hard work of professionals across the country have made the arts with handicapped persons a growing and inspiring national movement. NCAH's successes would not have been possible without Congress' continuous support and funding. We are asking for your continued interest so that we may continue our work and touch increasing numbers of the nation's 4.2 million handicapped children and youth.

During fiscal year 1982, NCAH's Very Special Arts Festival Program was operating in only 25 states. By 1984, these yearlong programs in the arts had reached every state, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The increase in VSAF Programs by over 100 percent occurred without any increase in the federal contribution. To support and sustain our efforts, NCAH now is seeking additional funding with which to:

(1) increase public awareness about the value of the arts in education as a way to successfully integrate disabled persons into the mainstream of cultural activities and into our society;

(2) expand the Very Special Arts Festival Program in every state and provide yearround opportunities in the arts to disabled children, youth and adults in schools and other community settings;

(3) establish a National Clearinghouse that will coordinate and disseminate information concerning arts by, with and for disabled persons so that artists, educators, parents and significant others can provide quality arts experiences.

Specifically, with the increased appropriation, NCAH would (a) ensure each state-level program is administered by a full-time professional in the arts with disabled persons; (b) stimulate increased level of support from the private sector through challenge grants, matching private dollars with federal funds on a one-to-one basis; (c) increase in-kind contributions of goods and services proportionately as 500,000 disabled students served in 1984 grows to an expected 750,000 students in 1985; and (d) create a databank for the collection and dissemination of relevant training and resource materials for use by the general public.

During the last year, several important reports on this country's educational system have been released and commanded a large share of public attention. Taken together, the reports give an inconsistent picture about the value of the arts. In your February 28, 1984 hearing, witnesses said that some of these reports emphasized the arts as basic to a quality education:

(1) The College Entrance Examination Board, in its report on academic preparation for college, was clear that the arts constitute one of the six "basic academic subjects" of a core curriculum that should also include English, mathmatics, science, social studies and foreign languages. The arts, according to the report, "challenge and extend human experience," represent a unique "record of diverse cultures" and provide "distinctive ways of understanding human beings and nature." The report also states that the arts, when taken in the high school curriculum, will enable college students to engage in a profit from advanced study and "permanently enhance the qualailty of their lives . . ."

(2) President Reagan's National Commission on Excellence in Education clearly recognizes the arts as a necessary component of education. In its report *A Nation At Risk: The Importance for Educational Reform*, a panel of experts said that the fine and performing arts complement the basic curriculum. The arts are one of the areas that give students a "sound base" during elementary grades when students are developing and enthusiasm for learning and developing their gifts and talents. The report advocates more rigourous attention to the arts than currently exists and "demands" the same level of performance as the Basics."

Other reports failed to address the arts:

(3) The twentieth Century Fund in its task force report on federal elementary and secondary education policy doesn't mention the arts at all. Eleven educational authorities that wrote the report on achieving quality in our schools are said to lack expertise in the arts. It was unclear from the report whether the authors (a) believe the arts are of little or no educational value or (b) the task force members lack sufficient knowledge about the arts and their potential educational value for all students.

(4) The report from the Education Commission of the States on *Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan To Improve Our Nation's Schools* is unclear about where it stands on the role of the arts in education. It leaves to interpretation whether the arts are considered academic disciplines or nonessential courses that should be eliminated.

Given the failure of these four reports to achieve a consensus on the role and value of the arts in education, NCAH believes Congress might address the inconsistencies by convening a special commission that would study the matter and make recommendations for use in future policy decisions on arts education in the nation's schools. NCAH would be pleased to lend its assistance to help the Congress bring together a panel of qualified individual's to address questions about the value, role and appropriateness of the arts in the education of handicapped and nonhandicapped children, youth and adults.

Where Do We Come From, Where Are We, Where Are We Going? The Arts as Basic in Education

Executive Director, Dr. Daniel G. Cannon, Natl. Art Educ. Assn., 1916 Assn. Dr., Reston, VA 22091. I must thank Paul Gauguin, in absentia, for allowing me to paraphrase the title of one of his great paintings as the lead-in to my remarks today. I believe we do need to think of ourselves in the context of the past, the present, and the future if we are going to avoid the pessimist position and direct ourselves instead toward an optimistic view about the arts in education.

Funk and Wagnalls tell us that basic means essential and fundamental. Education is the training of the mind, and the acquisition of knowledge or skills through study or instruction. So far, so good. What is missing in such definitions is content, only methodology is mentioned along with the generic term knowledge. Why then have we allowed those OTHER basic areas to dominate the curriculum?

Several years ago a Harris poll was conducted and over 65 percent of the people interviewed said more art was needed in the curriculum. In 1982, a Gallup poll survey found that over 40 percent of parents interviewed said changes were needed in the curriculum to meet today's needs. More emphasis on basics was the largest categorical reply. Other preferences were science, vocational courses, foreign language, and computer courses. Less than 2 percent said more arts were needed.

What has caused such a dramatic change in such a short time? There are quick answers available, chief among which is the faltering economy and, of course, the Commission Report.

A NATION AT RISK

But, my feeling, even my belief, is that we have done a lot of talking about the importance of the arts, but we haven't been very active on the implementation of our beliefs.

We have amassed evidence that fills volumes on what is basic in education. Burkhardt [1] looks at basic education as a continuing process which provides opportunity for students to become responsible, reasoning, perceptive individuals within communities; individuals capable of independent expression; individuals able to develop sufficient skills to meet their needs for employment and work, further education, and non-work goals and activities.

When we look at the 3 R's in the traditional sense, reading, writing and arithmetic, we realize that ony verbal and mathematical concepts are involved. Engel [2]

said "we commonly assume language to be the primary vehicle of communication and therefore to be basic. We have, however, many languages, and most are not verbal."

Verbal skills are emphasized so much today that few opportunities remain for children to express themselves through artistic means. Artistic involvements promote the development of visual as well as verbal vocabulary and this may be of utmost importance if we believe the scientific study that tells us 80 percent or more of learning is visual.

We should not be attempting to eliminate the content youngsters need to survive and thrive. They must be able to read, to figure, to understand the world of science, relate in social settings, and know how to stay healthy. But have we overreacted again, remember Sputnik, in a frantic race for short-term gains in reading and math scores? Goodlad remarked [3] "Little thought is given to whether the students interest and curiosity are aroused, their talents unleashed, their creativity fostered, or their sentiments and tastes refined. Presumably the almighty letter grade and the SAT score tell it all."

We cannot afford a narrow definition of basic education. The Council for Basic Education, in 1975, included the arts in their list of basics because the arts have generative powers.

There are dozens of claims for what the arts do for people. Included in Barzun's [4] list, a list which he seriously questions, are help for the development of comprehension skills, developing aesthetic potentials, transmitting the cultural heritage, supplying an outlet for self-expression, giving a chance to non-verbal minds, enlarging the understanding of man, mastering a system of symbols, filling in the outline of history, acquainting the child with foreign cultures, enhancing achievement in other subjects and counterbalancing utilitarian subjects.

We should keep in mind, when we think of reasons for having the arts in the curriculum, that any profession that seeks justification apart from its subject is on shaky ground.

Kaufman [5] said, "Art education ought to establish clearly and unambiguously its essential character independent of other purposes and become a self-sufficient discipline." This can be said for each of the arts but does not imply that they are mutually exclusive. Aesthetic modes of knowing and the basic rudiments of the arts disciplines would consititute an appropriately basic and significant contribution to student's education.

We are accused sometimes of using the pollyanna approach in promoting the arts. Fortunately we have watchdogs among our own ranks who offer constructive criticism and bring us to critical self-analysis.

Turnbull [6] told us: Arguments that art emphasizes cooperation rather than competition, good rather than evil, community instead of self-centeredness, are false. Such arguments do a great disservice because they aim to make of art an instrument, and its responders victims. Art is not a means for improvement, but an essential aspect of being.

Moral and ethical arguments in favor of art are equally unsupportable. The Greeks had exactly such a notion, and used idealizing harmonies of music as the basis of education, placing beauty at the beginning, an order imposed from without, used that order as if it were the Truth, and concluded that it therefore was good—beauty thus equated with goodness—the one presumed to lead to the other.

But the Greeks couldn't take account of life, couldn't change, were unable to adapt, and they perished at their most beautiful moment. They built a splendid coffin for themselves, and then had no alternative but to repose themselves in it.

There is no evidence that art or an acquaintance with art or a knowledge of art, or the making of art makes us better people. The collectors, listeners, and watchers of art are often rapacious, the makers of art often irresponsible, the users of art frenquently selfish and aggressive, like others people. But it isn't art which had made them that, any more than it has made others gentle and thoughtful.

Art cannot remake our world, correct our aggrandizing social behavior, but it can begin by putting us in touch with ourselves, and thus further the imperative task of inverting and reconstructing values so that people, people everywhere, take precedence over things, acquisitions, property, national pride, money, and brutalizing power.

The central nature of art is truth, not beauty, to articulate what we can know of feeling, to bring forth into concrete tangible form all that which is the intangible but entirely real experience of living. Art is not a prize, an award, a token, an embellishment. It arises contrarily out of the fundamental necessities of our beings. It is not a decorative corrective to life fastened on top, a cosmetic to make life more pleasant or more convenient or more comfortable, but a necessity which arises from

within the living experience, as earlier cultures have know. It is necessary because it is the one way we have of dealing with the intangible experiences of being and becoming. It is the one means available to us to articulate what is real, to say what it is like to be.

I am not asking that you buy these conceptions, only that you pause in the development of your rationale statements to consider the many sides of the question.

We must work vigorously to wed theory and practice in arts education if we are to not only survive but to grow. Theory is too often looked upon as the domain of science and arts people are seen as exoterics drifting about on pink clouds of fantasy. If arts people want to reverse this conception, they must come to grips with the fact that there are benefits in systematic thinking, planning, and investigation. How many curriculum guides in the arts can you think of that treat the arts as root disciplines, disciplines that specifically demand the same components required in the traditional basics?

Unfortunately, western culture looks at art as non-intellectual, in Eisner's [7] words, "a product of talent, something from the emotions rather than the intellect and since schools are places where the mind rather than the hand is educated, where ideas not images are cultivated, they should focus upon intelligence, thought, and cognition, not upon soul, emotion, or imagination."

It appears so obvious to art teachers, why is it so difficult for others to understand that the arts and humanities are the links to our common past and they help us retain human values in an increasingly electronic and mechanized society?

John F. Kennedy said, "the life of the arts, far from being an interruption, a distraction in the life of a nation, is very close to the center of the nation's purpose—and is a test of the quality of a nation's civilization."

The arts are not simply hobbies, not simply means to make time pass less tediously, not simply diversions competing for attention alongside other passive entertainments. [8] The arts are neither frills nor fancies, they are the signature of civilization.

Bushnell [9] remarked, "the arts tame the savage parts in us by affording for energies that must be released, energies that might otherwise be consumed in throwing bricks through windows—or in making speeches in public."

But the arts are silent, they do not speak for themselves, so sometimes we must speak publicly.

The arts are fundamental to all learning because they are unique in representing forms of knowledge and ways of learning that cannot be translated or expressed in other ways. The arts are disciplines that take years to acquire and which nothing short of genuine dedication can hope to obtain. Goodlad [10] said, "the arts open the learning pores and tend to awaken the senses and motivate further and deeper study in every field of knowledge."

The fact is that the arts are about what we know; they are about knowledge. And keep in mind that our earlier dictionary definition of education mentions knowledge. But in addition to knowledge, we must remember that the only things we make as human beings that are not tools, are works of art: paintings, sculpture, poems, dance movements, dramas and the like. These things are ends in themselves, not means—tools—toward ends.

Artists interpret and they create. Interpretative skills allow us to utilize media to produce surface and representative qualities. Creative skills include the abilities to think and work imaginatively in the production of original forms.

Experience in the arts develops insights and abilities which enhance the quality of life. Because the arts are, collectively, one of the most important repositories of culture, the study of them is one of the principle means we have for understanding ourselves and others. Studying historical and contemporary art forms from all cultures of the world provides students with a sense of their artistic heritage and an appreciation for the ways the arts contribute to transmitting culture and to maintaining and altering its values.

I turn now to comments made in support of the disciplines included within the arts by spokespersons from those disciplines.

Hanson said: [11] "Dance touches the fibers of life itself and expresses the substance of being; it intensifies and clarifies human experience; it develops physical, emotional, and intellectual capacities integrating them so they all function harmoniously." Dance allows us to ponder the wonder of our bodies, sense others so carefully that without a sound we can begin moving together. It allows us opportunities for selecting, forming, interpreting, and seeing ourselves as active shapers of our own lives not just passive, obedient responders.

Lynn, [12] speaking for theatre education, said, "Elementary children learn about their world by engaging in dramatic make believe allowing them to enhance their

perceptions through role identification, cooperation, collaboration, motivation, and appreciation. Secondary students are provided, through drama, a variety of opportunities to perceive, respond, understand, create, and evaluate. The post secondary drama experience involves analysis and synthesis, both necessary for making judgements. Theatre also teaches concentration, interpersonal skills, organization, problem solving, effective listening, leadership, and physical and vocal expressiveness."

The world of music does not lack, either, for spokespersons. A review of what music was to do for us in the past included promoting intellectual, moral, and physical growth, making healthier bodies, more alert minds, better citizens, and team spirit. Then came emphasis on the aesthetic qualities of music. But can you extoll the aesthetic to a school board member who doesn't know, or care, what aesthetic means?

In music, as in all the arts, it is easy to get caught up in the latest fad but, as stated earlier, to justify your area outside of itself is folly. Dillon [13] tells us, "when children participate in the school music program their imaginations are directed into positive creative experiences. They develop aesthetic sensitivity and appreciation and, by performing, build self-esteem, self-discipline, and a sense of accomplishment that is fundamental to learning."

Feldman [14] contends that visual art means work, language, and values. He says, "Work is one of the noblest expressions of the human spirit, and art is the visible evidence of work carried to the highest possible level." Even in circumstances of privation people devote hours to decorating tools and clothing and homes that would serve practical purposes just as well if they were left unadorned. [15] It appears there is a need to create, and creating involves work.

Feldman [16] goes on to explain, "the individual who cannot understand to read images is incompletely educated. By teaching pupils to describe, analyze, and interpert visual images, we enhance their powers of verbal expression." Without art, without imagery, symbolism, and visual relationships, language is reduced to emptiness. Words are cumulative in effect, art is frequently direct, instantaneous. The ability to visualize a new solution is the beginning of invention. But verbal and visual must constantly reinforce one another. [17]

And finally Feldman [18] shares with us the thought that art means values. "Art deals with durable human concerns and through art in different cultures we see a wide range of human values." The values present in visual forms are visual representations of values taught in other subjects. Beliefs are the foundation of attitudes and values, all of which are components of an ideology, and ideologies are learned, not innate, and can therefore, be changed. [19]

THE TEACHER

As agents of change, teachers must be on top of their field at all times. For teachers of the arts, this is especially important because arts teachers are mainly thought of as persons committed to doing things that are not really serious.

It is unrealistic to expect each school to have a complete staff in each art area but it is realistic for a school system to offer appropriate experiences. Goodlad [20] said that schools exist to prepare students to take a place in society and to develop individual talents and potentials. It would appear that to do the former without the latter would be like producing a motion picture but forgetting to remove the lens cap on the camera when shooting began.

Generally speaking, schools with good arts programs have strong commitment to the other education areas too. All educators meed first to develop themselves as creative individuals before attempting to guide others in the creative process. But all too often we see arts teachers treat the receipt of the bachelor's degree as terminal rather than as the key that opens the door to further growth. Adler [21] reminded us in the recently published *Paideia Proposal* that "learning never reaches a terminal point. As long as one remains alive and healthy, learning can go on—and should."

THE STUDENT

A child communicates his own experience in many ways. He speaks, sometimes just prattling; he sings, dances, cavorts; he paints, draws, scribbles; he makes mudpies, sandcastles, a snowman, or a sculpture; he recites doggerel, tells stories. At night he dreams and then translates his dreams into stories. All children do this in their own way, with varying degrees of excellence. No two children express themselves in an identical fashion. But all these ways—pictures, words, figures, song, dance, plays, stories, poetry, and combinations thereof—are enduring modes of expression. Only their style or manner is different. These forms of art are not frills to

be indulged in when there is time left over from the serious business of education. They are the central business of education, for they are part of the business of life.

Broudy [22] suggests that only the school can provide entry skills into the domain of aesthetic experience; basic to the educated life and mind. And good art programs in the schools enrich overall learning because they let children learn directly, not simply by hearing or looking but by doing; they help develop self-confidence, and provide a balance for areas requiring more empirical skills. Some say that children exposed to the arts may even draw on mental areas untapped by children raised and taught in aesthetically drab environments. Cultivation of the child's sensibilities cannot begin too early in life, and unless these senses are educated, along with the emotions and the intellect, you may have crippled a child who then becomes a crippled adult who never realizes his full potential. [23]

While most children will not grow up to be creators of art, they can become intelligent consumers in our society. We must ask ourselves the question, how can you recognize ugliness unless you have learned to recognize beauty? And who can better offer the guidance this requires than the teachers of the arts?

OTHER GROUPS

We have been emphasizing, to this point, the roles played by arts professionals, teachers, and students. No program, however good, will materialize without support from outside the arts per se. We must actively enlist the help of the groups that influence the decision-makers themselves.

If we believe for an instant that what happens at the public school level is not related to the political process, we delude ourselves. Activism is not something that just a few loonies do any more. It is what every citizen must do, has an obligation to do, about what they believe is important. [24] Every successful politician takes advantage of images and every enterprize depends on it. Yet, the curriculum of the school does not reflect the centrality of aesthetic experience.

What is needed is a larger investment in training arts teachers and parents in the persuasion and politics of education. The issue according to Hatfield, [25] is not working harder at what we are already doing but rather smarter within the political matrix of schools.

I believe we all should become political activists. The development of arts education programs is a matter of the effectiveness of individual arts educators, working in consort with parents, other faculty, administrators, P.T.A., Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, AAUW, and others in understanding the dynamics of the local school district.

Parents want the schools to keep the young under control. They want more than that, however. Parents too often look at the arts as frills as far as their children are concerned. If the day were longer art would be OK. But the day isn't longer and in our society, children pay a high price for faulty math, reading, or spelling. But I ask you, was your journey to this conference a stimulating aesthetic experience? Do you pass through a thrilling aesthetic environment on your way to and from work each day? Are the sounds you hear on 90% of the radio stations, the kinds that inspire you to greatness?

Have you gone outside your private realm in the past three months to offer a workshop to parents, to speak to the local service organization about the arts, to invite another faculty member into your classroom to see the wonders of your arts program?

Should you do at least one of the above? Should our primary energies come from us? How many of you are members of your local school board? Or on your city council? The presence of arts interested people on policy-making boards and commissions would strengthen our positions and help ensure greater sensitivity to arts interests.

ECONOMIC IMPACT AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Perhaps we go overboard when we speak of the wonderful, esoteric qualities of the arts. We are proud of these qualities and we have a right to be proud. But are we really so perfect that we can't talk about so crass a thing as economic impact through the arts? It is, or appears to be, an almost sure-fire way to get what we want.

Many people, possibly most people, think the arts are fine. A recent survey showed museum attendance at 360 million in a one year period, six times the number of people who attended all professional baseball, football, and basketball games combined. But the arts are not fine, according to most people, for someone who has to earn a reliable living. An arts group in Oregon decided to test such an assumption and, on investigation, found that the state Bureau of Statistics, not your typical group of wild-eyed radicals, listed 95 jobs in the visual arts alone on their

state roles. We must let people know that there are all manner of jobs in the arts as one more way to survive.

Check with any corporation and you will find that two of their basic questions in making a decision to locate somewhere are about the schools and the cultural opportunities available for their employees. They want their employees to be broadly educated as well as scientifically literate. I know of companies who send their engineers back to school to take work in the arts because they learn divergent thinking and problem solving strategies in those courses.

In New York City, enormous amounts of money are spent extolling that location as the arts capital of the world. Tourism is one of the greatest revenue gathering means available and the arts are the drawing card. The state of Iowa generated 82 million dollars in 1981 through arts programs. Washington state raised funding for the Arts Commission last year from 14.4 cents per capita to 50 cents because they realized the investment would be returned many times over in dollars generated. I'm trying to say that the more intelligent our people are about the arts when they enter the world of the consumer, the more likely they will be to support broader programs in the arts as adults.

The notion that everything will be alright in the end if we just wait patiently is indeed a naive one. We must push forward constantly and even become demanding if we truly believe that the arts are basic. Do you see the promoters of the other basic areas resting on their laurels? No, they promote their positions constantly.

FUNDING, THE FEDS, AND THE FUTURE

It might be of interest to you to hear a little bit about funding, the feds, and the future.

The primary agency in Washington for arts funding is the National Endowment for the Arts with Frank Hodsoll as its chairman. In the past four years, the NEA supported 425 grants in the amount of 98 million dollars. This funding generated an additional 653 million in contributed income. Hodsoll [26] said the nation spends nearly 100 billion annually on recreation and even a tiny portion of that amount is a vast potential pool for the arts.

Concern is sometimes expressed that the artists' in education program takes jobs away from regular classroom art teachers. I asked Joe Prince [27] about the program and he said, "it was never the intention of the Endowment to supplant strong arts education programs but rather to be an enrichment to them. Traditionally, they have done this in two ways: through the artists residency in educational settings and, through supporting exemplary projects which would help advance the arts in education." The Endowment is currently conducting an assessment to determine what might be an appropriate role to pursue in the future.

The information is incomplete, but the latest I have is that less than ½ of 1 per cent of the money appropriated in the block grants was used for arts in curriculum projects. We can have more influence in this sector if we really try. 1983 figures also show that state art agencies reported a 4.8 per cent gain from the previous year. We seem to have an irregular pattern at best.

There are other funding sources at the federal level, some of which may not be known to you. They include the Department of Agriculture's craft development program; the Department of Defense's art collections, bands, and choruses; the Department of Housing and Urban Development's program for arts and design in public housing; the Department of Interior's program for Indian Arts and Crafts; the Department of Justice's prison recreation program; the General Services Administration's Art-in-Architecture and Living Buildings programs; the International Communication Agency's cultural presentation programs and Fulbright-Hays exchanges, the Library of Congress' Archive of Folk Songs; and the Veterans Administration's fine arts commissions.

There are at least 43 separate programs providing funding for the arts, in some way. The large programs, however, get the most attention; the NEA at 142 million, the NEH at 130 million, the Smithsonian at 142 million, the National Gallery of Art at 29 million, the Historical Preservation Fund at 25 million, and the Institute of Museum Services at 11 million.

Representative Thomas J. Downey, [28] chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, said in the March, 1983 issue of *American Arts*, "This Administration has to be convinced of one basic truth; the strength of a nation lies in its culture and its spirit, as well as in its economy and its military." Yet we spend 500 million on the arts and 240 billion for the military. And while we worry because arts funding is so small, Downey considers this a blessing in disguise because if the amount were enormous there would be real trouble getting funded.

Private support for the arts must be mentioned too. In 1981, private giving totalled 54 billion and of this amount, the arts and humanities received about 6 per cent or 3.4 billion. It should be noted that of this amount, only 5½ per cent was given by corporations, 83 per cent from individuals, and the remainder from other sources. Corporations, however, can supply things we need other than money: advertising, materials and services, and support from their employees. Two groups, Debnan-Hughes, and R. J. Reynolds are standouts, along with giants like NCR, [29] Warner Communications, Atlantic Richfield, Burger King, McDonalds and Phillip Morris.

These, and other corporations are in agreement with the statement made by the American Express people, that "there aren't many Medicis, Rockefellers, or Mellons anymore." By aiding an arts organization, a company becomes an active and socially responsible member of the community.

I mentioned in my opening statement, we should direct ourselves toward an optimistic view about the arts in education. And I believe we can do this as we look toward the future.

The Stanford Research Institute [30] tells us that the U.S. is shifting from an industrial to a new information society; from a capital intensive, resource based economy to an economy based on services and the information and electronic technologies. Even today only ¼ of the work force is employed in manufacturing with over ½ employed in information-based jobs.

People involved in information-based jobs are, by-and-large, inner-directed, and inner-directed people tend to have great interest in all types of creative expression; dance, visual arts, music, and writing. These people may indeed bring a Renaissance in the arts. Their influence may have a ripple effect; Walt Whitman said, "to have great poets you must have great audiences too."

In a time of radical technological change, creative problem solving abilities are in great demand, *U.S. News and World Report* [31] experts predict 15 million new jobs will be created in the U.S. by 1990. New tasks that were scarcely imagined a few years ago will need resourceful people to perform them, the kind of people we produce in good art programs.

Computers should not be treated as enemies. The intelligent person makes the new work for him rather than fighting it. High tech is already being used in such distinguished art schools as Carnegie-Mellon, the University of California at San Diego, Syracuse, Pratt, the Art Institute of Chicago, and countless others.

But keep in mind too the Carnegie Report [32] admonition that, "virtually every new piece of hardware introduced into the schools in the past three decades has been oversold, misused, and eventually discarded. Most computer users in the future will require no more complicated skills than typing, reading, and writing."

The arts may save us from being overwhelmed by the intervention of technology. They will nourish our minds, our bodies, and our souls. They will serve as the basis human force in an otherwise technological world.

PROJECTIONS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

We need to look too at projections for enrollment in our schools. A recent Department of Education Weekly [33] had the following items listed for our consideration.

Pre-primary enrollment will increase by the mid-1980's; elementary enrollment will dip in 1985 and rise through the second half of the decade; secondary and undergraduate enrollments are expected to decline throughout the 80's but will rise again in the early 90's. Are we flexible enough in the arts to accommodate these shifts?

Population shifts are affecting us too. From 1971-1981, the enrollment in Illinois schools dropped 15.9 per cent; Iowa 19% Minnesota 14.9%, and South Dakota 20.3%. Idaho and Wyoming appear to be the hot spots having absorbed a shift of nearly 3.5% of the total population, or 1.5 million students. To maintain an average class size of 23 students, these two states require an additional 65,000 classrooms. I wonder how many of them will be for the arts?

At the same time, the newest date available tells us the average life expectancy is now 73 years of age. By comparison, in 1940 it was 62, in 1900 it was 47, in England in 1500 it was 33, in Rome in 50 B.C. it was 22, and in Greece in 700 B.C. it was 18. Do we have any arts program available for these older populations? Have we made room for new arts teachers when current laws make it illegal to use age as a factor in hiring or retirement?

Have we learned from the fact that in Japan the literacy rate is near 90% and that during the formative years from 3–6 years old, art is stressed in the learning environment. Their traditional academic training does not start until later. Is there

a correlation here that we could use to our advantage? The Scots have been educating children beginning at age 3 for generations now. Are we preparing art teachers for pre-school work?

One of the best ways we can prepare children for the new age is to help them develop their problem solving abilities. And the arts experience is a fundamental way to do this. The object is to equip a child to meet the future challenge creatively, regardless of the direction he decides to take.

And what about jobs? A study by the National Association of Independent School [34] shows that from 1977-82 in New England there were 3,108 vacancies in the arts and only 2,315 applicants.

And finally, what about all of these reports that are, if nothing else, getting people to think seriously about education again.

Last fall the Mortimer Adler group produced *The Paideia Proposal* [35] (Paideia is from the Greek word meaning the upbringing of the child). This was followed in April of 1983 by the College Board publication of *Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do.* And also in April appeared *A Nation At Risk*, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education.

My purpose here is not to go into extensive analysis of the 3 reports just mentioned. It seems appropriate, however, to mention that each of these studies include the arts as necessary, and in 2 cases, basic in education: In the *Paideia Proposal*, the Fine Arts are listed specifically under courses needed for the "acquisition of knowledge" and also under courses needed for "enlarged understanding of ideas and values."

In *Academic Preparation for College*, [36] the arts are specifically mentioned under "the basic academic subjects," and in *A Nation At Risk*, [37] while not mentioned with the basics, the arts are not totally neglected: on page 24 the report states, "a high level of shared edcucation in these basics (English, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Computer Science), together with work in the fine and performing arts and foreign languages, constitutes the mind and spirit of our culture." And on page 26: "The high school curriculum should also provide students with programs requiring rigorous effort in subjects that advance students' personal, educational, and occupational goals, such as the fine and performing arts . . ."

My primary problem with the *Nation at Risk* is that it has received the greatest attention, yet is one of the only reports in recent years that does not come right out and list art as basic.

The Carnegie Report states, "the arts are an essential part of the human experience. They are not a frill. We recommend that all students study the arts to discover how human beings use non-verbal symbols and communicate not only with words but through music, dance, and visual arts."

There is also Goodlad's, *A Study of Schooling* [38] in which he states that a better use of the time spent in school would allow work in the arts.

The American Federation of Teachers in the July *News Release* [39] speak of "quality education and quality teaching—a new agenda," stating the union is in favor of "stricter high school graduation requirements in academic subjects including math, science, English, history and foreign languages, though not at the expense of other essentials like music and arts."

Throughout these appraisals of education in the United States, several currents run. For those of us who believe in art education, the most important one is to know that we are not alone. We have supporters in high places but they look to us for the energy to promote what we know to be worthwhile—the arts for everyone. We cannot allow ourselves to sit on our aspirations, hoping that someone else will do our work for us. If we truly believe in our destiny we will fulfill it.

It must be time for me to conclude my remarks and I will close with a statement made by John Kenneth Galbraith's wife on the length of his speeches. She said, "dear, people may not be a great deal wiser but they are always a great deal older."

I thank you for your indulgence.

1. Kay Burkhardt, Montana State Department of Education, 1983.

2. Martin Engel, "The Arts as Basic Skills," Dobbs, Ed., *Arts Education and Back to Basics*, 1979. NAEA

3. John Goodlad, *The Dynamics of Educational Change*. /I/D/E/A/. Reports on Schooling, A Charles F. Kettering Program. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

4. Jacques Barzun, "Art and Educational Inflation," Keynote address for N.A.E.A. at Houston, April, 1978.

5. Irving Kaufman, "A Return to Fundamentals," in Dobbs, Ed., *Arts Education and Back to Basics*, 1979. NAEA.

6. Murray Turnbull, "More Than Meets The Eye." Keynote Address, 1981 Hawaii AAE Conference.

7. Elliot Eisner, "Implications of the New Educational Conservatism for the Future of the Arts in Education."
8. O. A. Bushnell, "Da Keed from Kaka'Ako" Keynote address, 1981, Hawaii AAE Conference.
9. John Goodlad, Facing the Future: *Issues in Education and Schooling. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.*
10. Margie Hanson, "Dance in Education," *Design: For Arts in Education.* Jan.-Feb. 1981.
11. Margaret Lynn, A.T.A. Policy Statement, *Interchange,* AAE, March-April, 1983.
12. Don Dillon, "Music is Basic," *Interchange,* AAE March-April, 1983.
13. Edmund B. Feldman, "Art in the Mainstream: A Statement of Value and Commitment," *Art Education,* September, 1982.
14. Jo M. Schumann, *Art From Many Hands,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981, quoted in Michael Day, "Art Means Work," *Art Education,* September, 1982.
15. Feldman, *Op. Cit.*
16. Ann S. Richardson, "Art Means Language," *Art Education,* September, 1982.
17. Feldman, *Op. Cit.*
18. Hermine Feinstein, "Art Means Values," *Art Education,* September 1982.
19. Goodlad, *Op. Cit.*
20. Mortimer Adler, *Paideia Proposal,* 1983.
21. Harry Broudy, "How Basic is Aesthetic Education? Or is 'RT the Fourth R?," *Educational Leadership,* 35(2): 131-41; November, 1977.
22. Margaret Cottom-Winslow
23. Peggy Johnson, *Art for the Fun of It, Prentice Hall*
24. Gene Wenner, "Arts and the Child," A.N.C. Conference
25. Thomas Hatfield. Rough draft of, "How Can Art Be Basic in Education?"
26. Frank Hodsoll, noted in David Curi, ed., *The Arts in Transition: Creative Responses.* Proceedings of the National Conference. 1982.
27. Joe Prince. Personal communique, March 9, 1983.
28. William Keens, "The Arts Caucus: Coming of Age in Washington. An Interview with Representative Thomas Downey," *American Arts,* March 1983.
29, ACUCAA, 2/83.
30. Stanford Research Institute, 1983.
31. *U.S. News and World Report,* 1983.
32. Carnegie Commission Report, 1983.
33. *DOE Weekly,* 1983.
34. NAIS, 1983.
35. M. Adler, *Op. Cit.*
36. College Board, *Academic Preparation for College,* 1983.
37. *A Nation at Risk,* 1983.
38. J. Goodlad, *A Study of Schooling,* 1983.
39. AFT *News Release,* July, 1983.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE CHILDREN'S ART CARNIVAL, NEW YORK, N.Y.

We at The Children's Art Carnival believe that in any civilized society there is a fundamental role that government must play in facilitating the free and creative expression of its people. We have worked in this community in support of this central principle to provide opportunities for people from all walks of life, cultural and economic, to express themselves. We have provided opportunities for children and youth to be productive and active in efforts to positively change themselves and their communities, utilizing the arts as a vehicle for change. The Carnival's programs incorporate a wide range of creative art activities, which include both traditional and non-traditional art forms, all of which are integrated with special emphasis on all of the Communication Arts. These programs serve approximately 12,000 young people each year. The Federal Government has been an active partner, and, in more recent years, has provided approximately one-third of the funds, thus helping us to develop and maintain our programs.

The Expansion Arts program of the National Endowment for the Arts has supported our efforts over the past 13 years.

For the past five years, we have also received funding for these programs from the United States Office of Career Training and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Basic Skills Division.

For the past eleven years, we have conducted a Creative Reading Through the Arts program for elementary-school age children, second through sixth grades, who are reading one to two years below their grade level. This program utilizes the arts as a bridge to reading and the language arts.

All of these programs have, in some way, had an impact on the nation, and have been replicated or recommended for replication throughout the United States.

The help of the Congressional Arts Caucus has made a tremendous difference in the lives of the many underprivileged youth that we have been able to serve. Roughly 4,000 youths in our program will be affected adversely because of cutbacks in Career Education and Basic Skills Training. This represents approximately $176,000 or forty-four dollars per child we serve. We are working hard to bridge this gap, which continues to widen due to the tremendous burden that the loss of this kind of funding has placed on the private funding sources.

We are hopeful that our legislators will recognize the adverse impact that the loss of these funds represents, and try diligently to begin to reinstate many of these valuable resources for the general well-being of our nation.

I thank you.

THE LOUISVILLE ORCHESTRA,
Louisville, Ky., March 23, 1984.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: It has come to our attention that your subcommittee has conducted hearings on the issue of arts in education.

We at the Louisville Orchestra believe that this is a very important issue and appreciate your efforts to bring it more attention. We hope that more arts organizations will initiate or expand their programs as a result of the hearings.

The Louisville Orchestra has had a long-standing commitment to music education. Our first music director, Robert Whitney, created a youth program shortly after the Orchestra was founded. For forty-five years, children throughout the region have attended our youth programs. This year, over 30,000 youngsters will participate in either of 3 programs—Listen & Look (grades K-3), Making Music (grades 3-6) or Soundsational (grades 6-12). We believe that the success of these programs rests on working closely with the school system to coordinate our programs with the curriculum. In doing so, we are able to show the integral nature of the arts in our society and demonstrate that they are not superfluous and not an unnecessary frill.

We are very proud of our record and hope that your hearings will spur a new wave of service to the children. There is no better time for action, for the future of our country rests in the hands of today's children.

If I can be of any assistance, I would be glad to help.

Sincerely,

KAREN R. DOBBS, *General Manager.*

ALLIANCE FOR ARTS EDUCATION/NEW JERSEY,
Ridgewood, N.J., April 4, 1984.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education Subcommittee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: On behalf of the Alliance for Arts Education/New Jersey (see enclosed brochure), we would like to go on record to request your increased fiscal support of arts in education on the federal level. We are deeply concerned about the unconscionable program and budget cuts for arts education during the Reagan administration. We feel strongly that the lack of commitment and leadership from the U.S. Department of Education for arts education has diminished its value in the eyes of administrators and members of school boards on the local level.

Why arts in education? In an age when information becomes obsolete by the time it is acquired, the educational process must teach flexibility and adaptability on many levels. It must also provide for the development of broad problem solving skills. The common foundations of all learning are rooted in man's capacity to explore, wonder and reflect, and in his desire to seek out the meaning and beauty of existence. Only when the arts are given a priority position in the curriculum for all, can these human needs be satisfied. Our educational system must provide the

means by which every individual can counteract the increasingly dehumanizing factors in our present and future hi tech life style. This can be achieved only through active involvement in the arts. It is the responsibility of educators to provide the proper climate and the means for developing all the attitudes and skills needed to realize this basic human need. The arts provide the best vehicle for teaching the basic skills as well as developing all aspects of the individual: intellectual, emotional, social, aesthetic, spiritual and physical.

The term "art" covers many disciplines. An artistic work by itself would be like the only telephone in the world; it is no good without someone on the other end. Art is communication of feelings, ideas and situations. Receiving the message is just as much "art" as sending the message, and what we receive depends very much on us. The perceptions, insights, and feelings each of us brings to an artistic experience will make it stimulating in a unique way. These same perceptions, insights, and values make life most interesting, more meaningful, and make us more adaptable to change. If students are accustomed to viewing themselves and their situation in a variety of ways, they will be less bothered by the unfamiliar, and the unexpected. They will be more able to recognize the opportunities, and more confident in choosing new directions and themselves. This is the humanistic approach. It is an openness approach to understanding ourselves, which allows us to make decisions on the basis of our own personal context.

Throughout the grades, students learn to use the tools of artistic pursuit. They learn to recognize the elements of composition, as rhythm, melody, harmony, and dynamics have become familiar concepts. The children study the traditional ways various elements have been used, and practice using them. They explore new patterns of their own. The students also begin to develop an eye and ear for what works and what does not, as well as what best expresses what they want to say. Learning to use materials and equipment is another part of arts exposure. The arts are "disciplines" that require concentration, attention to detail, and motor skills. Critical evaluation has always been the companion of arts and the arts student. The student learns objectivity and the ability to analyze personal work along with the work of others, in a way that is accurate and constructive. This process of evaluation is a particularly useful carry-over into other areas of study, as it requires that the student identify what will be accomplished, how to proceed, and how to recognize when that deal has been reached.

Creative thinking is largely an acquired skill, and it has to be reinforced on every level. It is not solely the domain of the arts. A better way is to teach the child to look for the whole panorama of an issue and to understand enough to form questions that will give this study direction. In this sense, the arts classes set an example for other classes, as they develop a climate and a taste in the student for intellectual pursuit. It is really a matter of teaching the individual how to learn, and that is something we should demand of our education.

We must acknowledge the value of the arts program. We must also accept the idea that arts are real education and not some garnish that would never be missed if it were left off the next time around. We must encourage the approval of budgets for the arts.

As members of the community, it is up to us to see that the federal government supports the arts in education programs so they will be what we want them to be. If we are successful, it is because we have made our wishes known. We have recognized the creativity in each of us and given that influence a priority.

The cause of arts in education certainly requires effort on the part of everyone involved. By putting the arts in the schools on an equal basis with other studies, we deliver a subtle yet persuasive message to our children that beauty, creativity and other humanistic values are important. In truth they may well be the very means of survival. They are certainly the things that will make survival worthwhile.

Sincerely,

LYNNE KRAMER,
Immediate Past President, Advocacy Chairman.

Lexington Philharmonic

George Zack, Music Director
Linda G. Moore, General Manager

March 23, 1984

The Honorable Carl Perkins
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Perkins:

It has come to our attention that on February 28th you held a subcommittee hearing on the arts in education. As an alumnus of the Hindman Settlement School, you are aware of the effects that an educational program with a fully integrated arts curriculum can have on the cultural health of a community or region. We commend your recent efforts to bring this issue to the attention of your colleagues in the Senate.

One of the main thrusts of the Lexington Philharmonic's activities in recent years has been expanded educational programming. We are currently presenting six (6) full orchestra performances for some 9,000 elementary school children from the surrounding area and, with assistance from the National Endowment for the Arts, our four small ensembles will present over thirty (30) in-school lecture-demonstrations serving another 25,000 students of the pre-school through junior high school age group. In two weeks we will complete the testing of a new Docent Program in five pilot schools. Based on the success of this program to date we anticipate offering pre-concert training for each classroom of students attending our full orchestra performances during the 1984-85 season.

While our young audiences have risen dramatically from the 9600 students served in 1980, we are committed to the importance of the arts as a part of the basic educational process and, thus, to increasing both the quality and quantity of our activities throughout central and eastern Kentucky.

We look forward to your continued interest in arts education and if we can be of any assistance in your efforts, please don't hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

Linda G. Moore

Linda G. Moore
General Manager

LGM/vr

412 Rose Street, Lexington, Kentucky 40508 606-233-4226